arXiv:1111.7276v1 [math.RT] 30 Nov 2011

Comparison of compact induction with parabolic induction

Henniart Guy, Vigneras Marie-France

December 1, 2011

Abstract

Let F be any non archimedean locally compact field of residual characteristic p, let G be any reductive connected F-group and let K be any special parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$. We choose a parabolic F-subgroup P of G with Levi decomposition $P = MN$ in good position with respect to K. Let C be an algebraically closed field of characteristic p. We choose an irreducible smooth C-representation V of K. We investigate the natural intertwiner from the compact induced representation $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ to the parabolically induced representation $\text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M(F)\cap K}^{M(F)} V_{N(F)\cap K})$. Under a regularity condition on V, we show that the intertwiner becomes an isomorphism after a localisation at a specific Hecke operator. When F has characteristic 0, G is F-split and K is hyperspecial, the result was essentially proved by Herzig. We define the notion of K-supersingular irreducible smooth C-representation of $G(F)$ which extends Herzig's definition for admissible irreducible representations and we give a list of K-supersingular irreducible representations which are supercuspidal and conversely a list of supercuspidal representations which are K-supersingular.

Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 Generalities on the Satake homomorphisms 4

3 Representations of $G(k)$ 8

4 Representations of $G(F)$ 12
4.1 Notations 12
4.2 $\mathcal{S}'$ is a localisation 12
4.3 Decomposition of the intertwiner 14

5 Hecke operators 15
5.1 Definition of Hecke operators 15
5.2 Compatibilities between Hecke operators 16

6 Main theorem 19

7 Supersingular representations of $G(F)$ 22

1 Introduction

Let F be a non archimedean locally compact field of residual characteristic p, let G be a reductive connnected F-group and let C be an algebraically closed field of characteristic

p. We are interested in smooth admissible C-representations of $G(F)$. Two induction techniques are available, compact induction $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)}$ from a compact open subgroup K of $G(F)$ and parabolic induction $\text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}$ from a parabolic subgroup $P(F)$ with Levi decomposition $P(F) = M(F)N(F)$. Here we want to investigate the interaction between the two inductions.

More specifically assume that $G(F) = P(F)K$ and $P(F) \cap K = (M(F) \cap K)(N(F) \cap K)$. We construct (Proposition 2.1) for any finite dimensional smooth C-representation V of K, a canonical intertwiner

$$I_0 : \ \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \to \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M(F)\cap K}^{M(F)} V_{N(F)\cap K}) \ ,$$

where $V_{N(F)\cap K}$ stands for the $N(F) \cap K$-coinvariants in V, and a canonical algebra homomorphism

$$\mathcal{S}' : \mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V) \to \mathcal{H}(M(F), M(F) \cap K, V_{N(F)\cap K}) \ ,$$

where as in [HV], the Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$ is $\text{End}_{G(F)} \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ seen as an algebra of double cosets of K in G, and similarly for $\mathcal{H}(M(F), M(F) \cap K, V_{N(F)\cap K})$. By construction

$$(I_0(\Phi(f)))(g) = \mathcal{S}'(\Phi)(I_0(f)(g)) \ ,$$

for $f \in \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \Phi \in \mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V), g \in G(F)$. Let V^* be the contragredient representation of V. We constructed in [HV] a Satake homomophism

$$\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V^*) \to \mathcal{H}(M(F), M(F) \cap K, (V^*)^{N(F)\cap K}) \ ,$$

and we show that $\mathcal{S}'$ and $\mathcal{S}$ are related by a natural anti-isomorphism of Hecke algebras (Proposition 2.4).

We study further I_0 in the particular case where K a special parahoric subgroup and V is irreducible. Such a V is trivial on the pro-p-radical K_+ of K. The quotient K/K_+ is the group of k-points of a connected reductive k-group G_k, so that we can use the theory of finite reductive groups in natural characteristic. We write $K/K_+ = G(k)$. The image of $P(F) \cap K = P_0$ in $G(k)$ is the group of k-points of a parabolic subgroup of G_k. We write $P_0/P_0 \cap K_+ = P(k)$, and we use similar notations for M and N and for the opposite parabolic subgroup $\overline{P} = M\overline{N}$ (Section 4.1). We choose a maximal F-split torus S in M such that K stabilizes a special vertex in the apartment of $G(F)$ associated to S. We choose an element $s \in S(F)$ which is central in $M(F)$ and strictly N-positive, in the sense that the conjugation by s strictly contracts the compact subgroups of $N(F)$. There a unique Hecke operator T_M in $\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)})$ with support in $M_0 s$ and value at s the identity of $V_{N(k)}$.

Proposition 1.1. *(Proposition 4.4) The map $\mathcal{S}'$ is a localisation at T_M.*

This means that $\mathcal{S}'$ is injective, T_M belongs to the image of $\mathcal{S}'$, and is central invertible in $\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)})$, and

$$\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) = \mathcal{S}'(\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V))[T_M^{-1}].$$

This comes from an analogous property of $\mathcal{S}$ proved in [HV]. We look now at the localisation Θ of I_0 at T_M

$$\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V),\mathcal{S}'} \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \to \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M(F)\cap K}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)}) \ .$$

Our main theorem is

Theorem 1.2. *(Theorem 4.5) Θ is injective, and Θ is surjective if and only if V is M-coregular.*

This result was essentially proved by Herzig [Herzig], [Abe], when F has characteristic 0, G is F-split and K is hyperspecial. In the theorem, $\overline{P} = M\overline{N}$ is the opposite parabolic subgroup of P, and we say that V is M-coregular if for $h \in K$ which does not belong to $P_0\overline{P}_0$, the image of $hV^{\overline{N}(k)}$ in $V_{N(k)}$ is 0. See Definition 3.7 and Corollary 3.20 for an equivalent definition. As in Herzig and Abe, we define in the last chapter the notion of a K-supersingular irreducible smooth C-representation of $G(F)$. We see our main theorem as the first step towards the classification of irreducible smooth C-representations of $G(F)$ in terms of supersingular ones.

To prove the theorem, we follow the method of Herzig and we decompose I_0 as the composite $I_0 = \zeta \circ \xi$ of two $G(F)$-equivariant maps, the natural inclusion ξ of $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ in $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} \text{c-Ind}_{P(k)}^{G(k)} V$, and

$$\zeta : \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} \text{c-Ind}_{P(k)}^{G(k)} V \to \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M(F)\cap K}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)}) \ ,$$

is a natural map associated to the quotient map $\text{c-Ind}_{P(k)}^{G(k)} V \to N_{N(k)}$ (see (2) below). We write $\mathcal{P}$ for the parahoric subgroup inverse image of $P(k)$ in K and $T_{\mathcal{P}}$ for the Hecke operator in $\mathcal{H}(G(F), \mathcal{P}, V_{N(k)})$ of support $\mathcal{P}s\mathcal{P}$ and value at s the identity of $V_{N(k)}$. With no regularity assumption on V we prove

$$\zeta \circ T_{\mathcal{P}} = T_M \circ \zeta \ .$$

Seeing $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} \text{c-Ind}_{P(k)}^{G(k)} V = \text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}$ and $\text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M(F)\cap K}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)})$ as $C[T]$-modules via $T_{\mathcal{P}}$ and T_M, the map ζ is $C[T]$-linear and we prove (Corollary 6.6):

Theorem 1.3. *The localisation at T of ζ is an isomorphism.*

To study ξ, we consider the Hecke operator T_G in $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$ with support KsK and value at s the natural projector $V \to V^{\overline{N}(k)}$, and the Hecke operator $T_{K,\mathcal{P}}$ from $\text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}$ to $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ of support $Ks\mathcal{P}$ and value at s given by the natural isomorphism $V_{N(k)} \to V^{\overline{N}(k)}$. With no regularity assumption on V we prove

$$T_{K,\mathcal{P}} \circ \xi = T_G \ .$$

Assuming that V is M-coregular we prove:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \circ T_{K,\mathcal{P}} &= T_{\mathcal{P}} \\ \mathcal{S}'(T_G) &= T_M \ . \end{aligned}$$

Seeing $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ as a $C[T]$-module via $T_G = (\mathcal{S}')^{-1}(T_M)$, the map ξ is $C[T]$-linear and :

Theorem 1.4. *The localisation at T of ξ is injective; it is an isomorphism if and only if V is M-coregular.*

Our main theorem follows.

A motivation for our work is the notion of K-supersingularity for an irreducible smooth C-representation π of $G(F)$ (that we do not suppose admissible).

Definition 1.5. *We say that π is K-supersingular when*

$$\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V),\mathcal{S}'} \text{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi) = 0$$

for any irreducible smooth C-representation V of K and any standard Levi subgroup $M \neq G$.

Hence π is K-supersingular when the localisations at T_M of

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$$

are 0 for all V and all $M \neq G$.

When π is admissible, this definition is equivalent to : No character of the center $\mathcal{Z}(G(F), K, V)$ of $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$ contained in $\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$ extends via $\mathcal{S}'$ to a character of $\mathcal{Z}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)})$ for all $V \subset \pi|_K, M \neq G$.

Equivalently: The localisations at T_M of the characters of $\mathcal{Z}(G(F), K, V)$ contained in $\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$ are 0 for all $V \subset \pi|_K, M \neq G$.

Herzig and Abe when G is F-split, K is hyperspecial and the characteristic of F is 0 ([Herzig] Lemma 9.9), used this property to define K-supersingularity.

The properties of K-supersingularity and of supercuspidality (not being a subquotient of $\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \tau$ for some irreducible smooth C-representation τ of $M(F) \neq G(F)$) are equivalent when G is F-split, K is hyperspecial and the characteristic of F is 0. With the main theorem, we obtain a partial result in this direction in our general case.

Theorem 1.6. *Let π be an irreducible smooth C-representation of $G(F)$.*

i. If π is isomorphic to a subrepresentation or is an admissible quotient of $\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \tau$ *as above, then π is not K-supersingular.*

ii. If π is admissible and

$$\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V),\mathcal{S}'} \mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi) \neq 0 \tag{1}$$

for some L-coregular irreducible subrepresentation V of $\pi|_K$ and some standard Levi subgroups $M \subset L \neq G$, then π is not supercuspidal.

2 Generalities on the Satake homomorphisms

In this first chapter we consider a rather general situation, where C is any field. We consider a locally profinite group G, an open subgroup K of G and a closed subgroup P of G satisfying "the Iwasawa decomposition" $G = KP$. We choose a smooth $C[K]$-module V. As in [HV], assume that P is the semi-direct product of a closed invariant subgroup N and of a closed subgroup M, and that K is the semi-direct product of $K \cap N$ by $K \cap M$. We also impose the assumptions

(A1) Each double coset KgK in G is the union of a finite number of cosets Kg' and the union of a finite number of cosets $g''K$ (the first condition is equivalent to the second by taking the inverses).

(A2) V is a finite dimensional C-vector space.

The smooth $C[K]$-module V gives rise to a compactly induced representation $\text{c-Ind}_K^G V$ and a smooth $C[P]$-module W gives rise to the full smooth induced representation $\mathrm{Ind}_P^G W$. We consider the space of intertwiners

$$\mathcal{J} := \mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W) .$$

By Frobenius reciprocity for compact induction (as K is open in G), the C-module $\mathcal{J}$ is canonically isomorphic to $\mathrm{Hom}_K(V, \mathrm{Res}_K^G \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W)$; to an intertwiner I we associate the function $v \mapsto I[1, v]_K$ where $[1, v]_K$ is the function in $\text{c-Ind}_K^G V$ with support K and value v at 1. By the Iwasawa decomposition and the hypothesis that K is open in G , we get by restricting functions to K an isomorphism of $C[K]$-modules from $\mathrm{Res}_K^G \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W$

onto $\mathrm{Ind}_{K\cap P}^K(\mathrm{Res}_{K\cap P}^P W)$. Using now Frobenius reciprocity for the full smooth induction $\mathrm{Ind}_{K\cap P}^K$ from $P\cap K$ to K, we finally get a canonical C-linear isomorphism

$$\mathcal{J} \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{P\cap K}(V, W)$$

(we now omit mentionning the obvious restriction functors in the notation); this map associates to an intertwiner I the function $v \mapsto (I[1,v]_K)(1)$.

We could have proceeded differently, first applying Frobenius reciprocity to $\mathrm{Ind}_P^G W$, getting $\mathcal{J} \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_P(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, W)$, then identifying $\mathrm{Res}_P^G\,\text{c-Ind}_K^G V$ with $\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap P}^P V$, and finally applying Frobenius reciprocity to $\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap P}^P V$. In this way we also obtain an isomorphism of $\mathcal{J}$ onto $\mathrm{Hom}_{P\cap K}(V, W)$, which is readily checked to be the same as the preceding one.

Assume also that W is a smooth $C[M]$-module, seen as a smooth $C[P]$-module by inflation. Then $\mathrm{Ind}_P^G W$ is the "parabolic induction" of W, and $\mathrm{Hom}_{P\cap K}(V, W)$ identifies with $\mathrm{Hom}_{K\cap M}(V_{N\cap K}, W)$, where $V_{N\cap K}$ is the space of coinvariants of $N\cap K$ in V. With that identification, an intertwiner I is sent to the map from $V_{N\cap K}$ to W sending the image $\overline{v}$ of $v\in V$ in $V_{N\cap K}$ to $(I[1,v]_K)(1)$. By Frobenius reciprocity again $\mathrm{Hom}_{K\cap M}(V_{N\cap K}, W)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Hom}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}, W)$, so overall we obtain an isomorphism

$$j : \mathcal{J} = \mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W) \to \mathrm{Hom}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}, W)\ , \tag{2}$$

which associates to $I \in \mathcal{J}$ the $C[M]$-linear map sending $[1,\overline{v}]_{M\cap K}$ to $(I[1,v]_K)(1)$.

The isomorphism j is natural in V and W. The functor $W \to \mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W)$ from the category of smooth $C[M]$-modules to the category of sets is representable by $\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}$, and $\mathrm{End}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V)$ embeds naturally in the ring of endomorphisms of the functor. By Yoneda's Lemma ([HS] Prop. 4.1 and Cor. 4.2), we have an algebra homomorphism

$$\mathcal{S}' : \mathrm{End}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V) \to \mathrm{End}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K})$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W) \arrow[r, "j"] \arrow[d, "b"'] & \mathrm{Hom}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}, W) \arrow[d, "\mathcal{S}'(b)"'] \\
\mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W) \arrow[r, "j"'] & \mathrm{Hom}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}, W)
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative for any W. We have $j(I\circ b) = j(I)\circ \mathcal{S}'(b)$ for $b \in \mathrm{End}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V)$.

By the naturality of j in W, for any homomorphism $\alpha : W' \to W$ of smooth $C[M]$-modules we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W') \arrow[r, "j'"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{Ind}(\alpha)"] & \mathrm{Hom}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}, W') \arrow[d, "\alpha"] \\
\mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W) \arrow[r, "j"'] & \mathrm{Hom}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}, W)
\end{tikzcd}$$

for any V. For $W = W'$ we obtain $j((\mathrm{Ind}_P^G a)\circ I) = a \circ j(I)$ for $a \in \mathrm{End}_M(W)$.

For $W' = \text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}$, we write $j' = j_0$,

$$j_0 : \mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K})) \to \mathrm{End}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K})\ .$$

We define I_0 in $\mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}))$ such that $j_0(I_0)$ is the unit element of $\mathrm{End}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K})$. We have

$$j_0((\mathrm{Ind}_P^G \alpha) \circ I_0) = \alpha$$

for all α in $\mathrm{Hom}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}, W)$. For $W = W' = \text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}$, we obtain

$$j_0((\mathrm{Ind}_P^G a) \circ I_0) = a \ . \tag{3}$$

for $a \in \mathrm{End}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K})$. For $b \in \mathrm{End}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V)$ we have

$$\mathcal{S}'(b) := j_0(I_0 \circ b) \ . \tag{4}$$

Applying j_0^{-1} to this equality we deduce from (3)

$$I_0 \circ b = (\mathrm{Ind}_P^G \mathcal{S}'(b)) \circ I_0 \tag{5}$$

for $b \in \mathrm{End}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V)$. Summarizing we have proved

Proposition 2.1. *(i) The map*

$$\mathcal{S}' : \mathrm{End}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V) \to \mathrm{End}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K})$$

is an algebra homomorphism such that $I_0 \circ b = (\mathrm{Ind}_P^G \mathcal{S}'(b)) \circ I_0$ *for* $b \in B$.

(ii) We have for α *in* $\mathrm{Hom}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{K\cap M}^M V_{N\cap K}, W)$,

$$j((\mathrm{Ind}_P^G \alpha) \circ I_0) = \alpha \ .$$

(iii) We have $j(I \circ b) = j(I) \circ \mathcal{S}'(b)$ *for* $b \in B$ *and* I *in* $\mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W)$.

Remark 2.2. i. An intertwiner I in $\mathrm{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V, \mathrm{Ind}_P^G W)$ is determined by the values $(I[1,v]_K)(1)$ in W, for all $v \in V$, by the Iwasawa decomposition $G = PK$. We have

$$(I_0[1,v]_K)(1) = [1,\overline{v}]_{M\cap K} \ .$$

ii. So far we have not used that V is finite dimensional.

We now want to interpret the previous results in terms of actions of Hecke algebras.

By Frobenius reciprocity $B = \mathrm{End}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V)$ identifies with $\mathrm{Hom}_K(V, \mathrm{Res}_K^G \text{c-Ind}_K^G V)$, as a C-module; to $\Phi \in B$ we associate the map $v \mapsto \Phi_v := \Phi([1,v]_K)$; from Φ then, we get a map $G \to \mathrm{End}_C V \ , \ g \mapsto \{v \mapsto \Phi_v(g)\}$. In this way we identify B with the space $\mathcal{H}(G,K,V)$ of functions Φ from G to $\mathrm{End}_C V$ such that

(i) $\Phi(kgk') = k \circ \Phi(g) \circ k'$ for k, k' in K, g in G, where we have written k, k' for the endomorphisms $v \mapsto kv, v \mapsto k'v$ of V;

(ii) The support of Φ is a finite union of double cosets KgK.

The algebra structure on $\mathcal{H}(G,K,V)$ obtained from that of B is given by convolution

$$\Phi * \Psi(g) = \sum_{h\in G/J} \Phi(h)\Psi(h^{-1}g) = \sum_{h\in J\backslash G} \Phi(gh^{-1})\Psi(h)$$

(the term $\Phi(h)\Psi(h^{-1}g)(v)$ vanishes, for fixed g, outside finitely many cosets Kh, so that the sum makes sense). Moreover the action of $\mathcal{H}(G,K,V)$ on $\text{c-Ind}_K^G V$ is also given by convolution

$$\Phi * f(g) = \sum_{h\in G/J} \Phi(h)(f(h^{-1}g)) = \sum_{h\in J\backslash G} \Phi(gh^{-1})(f(h)) \ .$$

Proposition 2.3. *The homomorphism* $\mathcal{S}' : \mathcal{H}(G,K,V) \to \mathcal{H}(M, K\cap M, V_{N\cap K})$ *is given by*

$$\mathcal{S}'(\Phi)(m)(\overline{v}) = \sum_{n\in(N\cap K)\backslash N} \overline{\Phi(nm)(v)} \quad \text{for} \quad m\in M, v\in V \ ,$$

where bars indicate the image in $V_{N\cap K}$ *of elements in* V.

Proof. As $[1,\overline{v}]_{M\cap K} = I_o[1,v]_K(1)$ we have for $v\in V$,

$$\mathcal{S}'(\Phi) * [1,\overline{v}]_{M\cap K} = \mathcal{S}'(\Phi) * (I_o[1,v]_K(1)) = (\mathcal{S}'(\Phi) I_o([1,v]_K))(1) = I_o(\Phi * [1,v]_K)(1) \ .$$

We write the element $I_o(\Phi * [1,v]_K)(1)$ of c-$\mathrm{Ind}_{M\cap K}^M V_{N\cap K}$ as a finite sum of $m^{-1}[1,w_m]_{K\cap M}$ for m running over a system of representatives of $M\cap K\backslash M$, where $w_m = (I_o(\Phi * [1,v]_K)(1))(m)$. Then $\mathcal{S}'(\Phi) * [1,\overline{v}]_{M\cap K}$ is the sum of $m^{-1}[1,w_m]_{K\cap M}$ for $m\in M\cap K\backslash M$. We compute now w_m.

Using the Iwasawa decomposition we write the element $\Phi([1,v]_K)$ of c-$\mathrm{Ind}_K^G V$ as the sum of $h^{-1}[1,v_h]_K$ where $v_h = (\Phi([1,v]_K))(h) = \Phi(h)(v)$, for h running over a system of representatives of $(P\cap K)\backslash P$. As

$$(I_o(h^{-1}[1,v_h]))(1) = (h^{-1} I_o[1,v_h])(1) = (I_o[1,v_h])(h^{-1}) = h^{-1}((I_o[1,v_h])(1)) = m_{h^{-1}}[1,\overline{v_h}] \ ,$$

where m_h is the image of h in M, and $m_{h^{-1}} = m_h^{-1}$, we obtain

$$I_o(\Phi * [1,v])(1) = \sum_{h\in(P\cap K)\backslash P} m_h^{-1}[1,\overline{v_h}] = \sum_{m\in(M\cap K)\backslash M} m^{-1}[1,w_m] \ ,$$

$$w_m = \sum_{n\in(N\cap K)\backslash N} [1,\overline{v_{nm}}] = \sum_{n\in(N\cap K)\backslash N} \overline{\Phi(nm)(v)}] \ .$$

□

In [HV] we constructed a Satake homomorphism

$$\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{H}(G,K,V) \to \mathcal{H}(M, K\cap M, V^{N\cap K}) \quad , \quad \mathcal{S}(\Phi)(m)(v) = \sum_{n\in N/(N\cap K)} \Phi(mn)(v) \ ,$$

for $v\in V^{N\cap K}$. To compare $\mathcal{S}'$ with $\mathcal{S}$ we need to take the dual. Remark that K acts on the dual space $V^* = \mathrm{Hom}_C(V,C)$ of V via the contragredient representation, and that the dual of V^* is isomorphic to V by our finiteness hypothesis on V. It is straightforward to verify that the map

$$\iota : \mathcal{H}(G,K,V^*) \to \mathcal{H}(G,K,V) \quad , \quad \iota(\Phi)(g) := (\Phi(g^{-1}))^t \ ,$$

where the upper index t indicates the transpose, is an algebra anti-isomorphism. We denote A^0 the opposite ring of a ring A. A ring morphism $f : A \to B$ defines a ring morphism $f^0 : A^0 \to B^0$ such that $f^0(a) = f(a)$ for $a\in A$. We view ι as an isomorphism from $\mathcal{H}(G,K,V^*)$ onto $\mathcal{H}(G,K,V)^0$. The linear forms on V which are $(N\cap K)$-fixed identify with the linear forms on $V_{N\cap K}$,

$$(V_{N\cap K})^* \simeq (V^*)^{N\cap K} \ .$$

This leads to an algebra isomorphism

$$\iota_M : \mathcal{H}(M, M\cap K, (V^*)^{N\cap K}) \to \mathcal{H}(M, M\cap K, V_{N\cap K})^0 \ .$$

The following proposition describes the relation between the Satake homomorphism $\mathcal{S}$ attached to V^* and the homomorphism $\mathcal{S}'$ attached to V.

Proposition 2.4. *The following diagram is commutative*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{H}(G,K,V^*) \arrow[r, "\mathcal{S}"] \arrow[d, "\iota"'] & \mathcal{H}(M, M\cap K, (V^*)^{N\cap K}) \arrow[d, "\iota_M"'] \\
\mathcal{H}(G,K,V)^0 \arrow[r, "\mathcal{S}'^0"] & \mathcal{H}(M, M\cap K, V_{N\cap K})^0 .
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. For $v \in V$ of image $\overline{v}$ in $V_{N\cap K}$ we have:

$$((\iota_M \circ \mathcal{S})\Phi)(m)(\overline{v}) = (\mathcal{S}(\Phi)(m^{-1})^t(\overline{v}) = \overline{\sum_{n\in N/(N\cap K)} \Phi(m^{-1}n)^t(v)}$$

$$= \overline{\sum_{n\in (N\cap K)\backslash N} \Phi((nm)^{-1})^t(v)} = ({\mathcal{S}'}^0 \circ \iota)(\overline{v}) \ .$$

$\square$

3 Representations of $G(k)$

Let C be an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic p, let k be a finite field of the same characteristic p and of cardinal q, and let G be a connected reductive group over k. We fix a minimal parabolic k-subgroup B of G with unipotent radical U and maximal k-subtorus T. Let S be the maximal k-split subtorus of T, let $W = W_G = W(S,G)$ be the Weyl group, let $\Phi = \Phi_G$ be the roots of S with respect to U (called positive), $\Delta \subset \Phi$ the subset of simple roots. For $a \in \Phi$, let U_a be unipotent subgroup denoted in ([BTII] 5.1) by $U_{(a)}$. A parabolic k-subgroup P of G containing B is called standard, and has a unique Levi decomposition $P = MN$ with Levi subgroup M containing T. The standard Levi subgroup $P = MU = UM$ is determined by M. There exists a unique subset $\Delta_M \subset \Delta$ such that M is generated by T, U_a, U_{-a} for a in the subset of Φ generated by Δ_M. This determines a bijection between the subsets of Δ and the standard parabolic k-subgroups of G.

Let $\overline{B} = T\overline{U}$ be the opposite of $B = TU$, and $\overline{P} = M\overline{N}$ the opposite of P. We have $\overline{B} = w_0 B w_0^{-1}$ where $w_0 = w_0^{-1}$ is the longest element of W. The roots of S with respect to $\overline{U}$, i.e. the positive roots for $\overline{U}$, are the negative roots for U. The simple roots for $\overline{U}$ are $-a$ for $a \in \Delta$.

For $a \in \Delta$ let $G_a \subset G$ be the subgroup generated by the unipotent subgroups U_a and U_{-a}. Let $T_a := G_a \cap T$.

Definition 3.1. *Let $a \in \Delta$ be a simple root of S in B and let $\psi : T(k) \to C^*$ be a C-character of $T(k)$. We denote by*

$$\Delta_\psi \quad := \quad \{a \in \Delta \mid \psi(T_a(k)) = 1\}$$

the set of simple roots a such that ψ is trivial on $T_a(k)$.

Example 3.2. $G = GL(n)$. Then $T = S$ is the diagonal group and the groups T_a for $a \in \Delta$ are the subgroups $T_i \subset T$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, with coefficients $x_i = x_{i+1}^{-1}$ and $x_j = 1$ otherwise. When $k = \mathbb{F}_2$ is the field with 2 elements, $T(k)$ is the trivial group.

Let V be an irreducible C-representation of $G(k)$. When $P = MN$ is a standard parabolic subgroup of G, we recall that the natural action of $M(k)$ on $V^{N(k)}$ is irreducible ([CE] Theorem 6.12). In particular, taking the Borel subgroup $B = TU$, the dimension of the vector space $V^{U(k)}$ is 1 and the group $T(k)$ acts on $V^{U(k)}$ by a character ψ_V.

Proposition 3.3. *The stabilizer in* $G(k)$ *of the line* $V^{U(k)}$ *is* $P_V(k)$ *where* $P_V = M_V N_V$ *is a standard parabolic subgroup of* G *associated to a subset* $\Delta_V \subset \Delta_{\psi_V}$*.*

Proof. [Curtis] Theorem 6.15. $\square$

Corollary 3.4. *The dimension of* V *is* 1 *if and only if* $P_V = G$*.*

Proof. If the dimension of V is 1, then $V = V^{U(k)}$ and $P_V = G$. Conversely if $P_V = G$ the line $V^{U(k)}$ is stable by $G(k)$ hence is equal to the irreducible representation V. $\square$

Corollary 3.5. *When* $P = MN$ *is a standard parabolic subgroup of* G*, the dimension of* $V^{N(k)}$ *is equal to* 1 *if and only if* $P \subset P_V$*.*

Remark 3.6. i. The group P_V measures the irregularity of V. A 1-dimensional representation V is as little regular as possible ($P_V = G$), and V is as regular as possible when $P_V = B$.

ii. The group P_V depends on the choice of B. Two minimal parabolic k-subgroups of $G(k)$ are conjugate in $G(k)$ and for $g \in G(k)$, the stabilizer of $V^{gU(k)g^{-1}} = gV^{U(k)}$ is $gP_V g^{-1}$. But the inclusion $P \subset P_V$ depends only on P because

$$gB(k)g^{-1} \subset P(k) \text{ is equivalent to } g \in P(k)$$

([Bki] chapitre IV, §2, 2.5, Prop. 3). The inclusion $P_V \subset P$ depends also only on P, for the same reason.

Definition 3.7. *We say that*

i. V *is* M*-regular when the stabilizer* $P_V(k)$ *in* $G(k)$ *of the line* $V^{U(k)}$ *is contained in* $P(k)$*,*

ii. V *is* M*-coregular when the stabilizer* $\overline{P}_V(k)$ *in* $G(k)$ *of the line* $V^{\overline{U}(k)}$ *is contained in* $\overline{P}(k)$*.*

We recall the classification of the C-irreducible representations V of $G(k)$.

Theorem 3.8. *The isomorphism class of* V *is characterized by* ψ_V *and* $\Delta_V \subset \Delta_{\psi_V}$*. For each* C*-character* ψ *of* $T(k)$ *and each subset* $J \subset \Delta_\psi$ *there exists a* C*-irreducible representation* V *of* $G(k)$ *such that* $\psi_V = \psi, \Delta_V = J$*.*

Proof. ([Curtis] Theorem 5.7). $\square$

Definition 3.9. (ψ_V, Δ_V) *are called the parameters of the irreducible* C*-representation* V *of* $G(k)$*.*

Example 3.10. The irreducible representations V with $\psi_V = 1$ are classified by the subsets of Δ. They are the special representations called sometimes the generalized Steinberg representations. We denote by Sp_P the special representation V such that $\Delta_V = \Delta_M$ with $P = MN$. The representation Sp_G is the trivial character and Sp_B is the Steinberg representation.

For a standard parabolic subgroup $P = MN$, the irreducible C-representation $V^{N(k)}$ of $M(k)$ is associated to ψ_V and to $\Delta_V \cap \Delta_M$.

Proposition 3.11. *The* M*-regular irreducible* C*-representations* V *of* $G(k)$ *are in bijection with the irreducible representations of* $M(k)$ *by the map* $V \mapsto V^{N(k)}$*. Those representations* V *with* $M_V = M$ *correspond to the characters of* $M(k)$*.*

Proof. For a given irreducible representation W of $M(k)$ of parameter (ψ_W, Δ_W) with $\Delta_W \subset \Delta_{\psi_W} \cap \Delta_M$, where $\Delta_{\psi_W} \subset \Delta$ is the set of $a \in \Delta$ with ψ_W trivial on $T_a(k)$, the number of isomorphism classes of irreducible C-representations V of $G(k)$ with $\overline{V}$ isomorphic to W, is equal to the number of subsets of $\Delta_{\psi_W} - (\Delta_{\psi_W} \cap \Delta_M)$. Only one of them satisfies $\Delta_V \subset \Delta_M$. There is a unique (modulo isomorphism) V with $\overline{V} \simeq W$ if and only if ψ_W is not trivial on $T_a(k)$, for all $a \in \Delta - \Delta_M$. ☐

The parameters (ψ_V, Δ_V) depend on the choice of the pair (T, U). The parameters $(\overline{\psi}_V, \overline{\Delta}_V)$ of V for the opposite pair $(T, \overline{U})$ are:

Lemma 3.12. $\overline{\psi}_V = w_0(\psi_V)$, $\overline{\Delta}_V = w_0(\Delta_V)$.

Proof. As $\overline{B} = w_0 B w_0^{-1}$, the torus $T(k)$ acts by the character $w_0(\psi_V)$ on the line $V^{\overline{U}(k)}$ and $\overline{P}_V = w_0 P_V w_0^{-1}$ is the stabilizer of the line $V^{\overline{U}(k)}$. Hence the subset $\overline{\Delta}_V$ of simple roots is equal to $w_0(\Delta_V) \subset -\Delta$. ☐

The contragredient representation V^* is irreducible and its parameters for the pair (T, U) are:

Lemma 3.13. $\psi_{V^*} = w_0(\psi_V)^{-1}$, $\Delta_{V^*} = -w_0(\Delta_V)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.12 it is equivalent to describe the parameters $(\overline{\psi}_{V^*}, \overline{\Delta}_{V^*})$ for the opposite pair $(T, \overline{U})$. The direct decomposition $V = V^{U(k)} \oplus (1 - \overline{U}(k))V$ implies

$$(V^*)^{\overline{U}(k)} = (V_{\overline{U}(k)})^* \simeq (V^{U(k)})^* \ .$$

The group $T(k)$ acts on the line $V^{U(k)}$ by the character ψ_V and on $(V^{U(k)})^*$ by the character ψ_V^{-1}. Hence $\overline{\psi}_{V^*} = \psi_V^{-1}$.

The space $(V^*)^{\overline{U}(k)}$ is the subspace of elements on V^* vanishing on $(1 - \overline{U}(k))V$. This space is stable by $M_V(k)$ because the direct decomposition of V for B is the same than for P_V (Remark 3.16). Hence $M_V \overline{U} \subset \overline{P}_{V^*}$, equivalently $-\Delta_V \subset \overline{\Delta}_{V^*} = w_0(\Delta_{V^*})$. As V is isomorphic to the contragredient of V^* and $-w_0$ is an involution on Δ, we have also the inclusion in the other direction. ☐

Remark 3.14. In general, $-w_0$ does not act by id on Δ (for example for $G = GL(3)$), hence the stabilizer $\overline{P}_V$ of $V^{\overline{U}(k)}$ in $G(k)$ is not the opposite of P_V, the M-regularity of V is not equivalent to the M-coregularity of V. The M-regularity of V is equivalent to the M-coregularity of V^*.

Proposition 3.15. *We have the $M(k)$-equivariant direct decomposition:*

$$V \ = \ V^{N(k)} \ \oplus \ (1 - \overline{N}(k))V^{N(k)} \ = \ V^{N(k)} \ \oplus \ (1 - \overline{N}(k))V \quad .$$

Proof. ([CE] Theorem 6.12). ☐

Remark 3.16. The decomposition is the same for $P = P_V$ than for $P = B$ because $V^{U(k)} = V^{N_V(k)}$ by definition de P_V.

Proposition 3.17. *For $g \in G(k)$, the image of $gV^{U(k)}$ in $V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ is not 0 if and only if $g \in \overline{P}(k) P_V(k)$.*

Proof. It is clear that the non vanishing condition on g depends only on $\overline{P}(k) g P_V(k)$ and that the image is not 0 when $g = 1$. We prove that the image of $gV^{U(k)}$ in $V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ is 0 when g does not belong to $\overline{P}(k) P_V(k)$.

a) We reduce to the case where G_{der} is simply connected by choosing a z-extension defined over k,

$$1 \to R \to G_1 \to G \to 1 \ ,$$

where $R \subset G_1$ is a central induced k-subtorus and G_1 is a reductive connected k-group with $G_{1,der}$ simply connected. The sequence of rational points

$$1 \to R(k) \to G_1(k) \to G(k) \to 1$$

is exact. The parabolic subgroups of G_1 inflated from P, P' are $P_1 = M_1 N, P'_1 = M'_1 N'$ where $1 \to R \to M_1 \to M \to 1$ and $1 \to R \to M'_1 \to M' \to 1$ are z-extensions defined over k. We consider V as an irreducible representation of $G_1(k)$ where $R(k)$ acts trivially. The image of $G_1(k) - \overline{P}_1(k)P'_1(k)$ in $G(k)$ is $G(k) - \overline{P}(k)P'(k)$. For $g_1 \in G_1(k) - \overline{P}_1(k)P'_1(k)$ of image $g \in G(k) - \overline{P}(k)P'(k)$, the image of $g_1 V^{N'(k)}$ in $V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ is 0 if and only if the image of $gV^{N'(k)}$ in $V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ is 0.

b) The proposition can be reformulated in terms of Weyl groups because the equality depends only on the image of g in $\overline{P}(k)\backslash G(k)/P'(k) = W_M \backslash W / W_{M'}$. We denote $\dot{w}$ a representative of $w \in W$ in $G(k)$. The proposition says that the image of $\dot{w}V^{N'(k)}$ in $V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ is 0 if $w \in W$ does not belong to $W_M W_{M'}$ under the hypothesis $W_V = W_M$ or $W_V = W_{M'}$ or $W_V \subset W_M \cap W_{M'}$.

c) We suppose that G_{der} is simply connected. Then we recall that V is the restriction of an irreducible algebraic representation $F(\nu)$ of G of highest weight ν equal to a q-restricted character of T (**??** Appendix 1.3). The stabilizer W_ν of ν in W is W_V, $F(\nu)^N$ is the irreducible algebraic representation $F(\nu)$ of M of highest weight ν, and is equal to the sum of all weight spaces $F(\nu)_\mu$ with $\nu - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}\Phi_M$; for $w \in W$, $w\nu$ is a weight of $F(\nu)^N$ if and only if $w \in W_M W_V$. ([Herzig] Lemma 2.3, and proof of lemma 2.17 in the split case). The space $V^{N(k)}$ is the restriction of $F(\nu)^N$.

We deduce that the decomposition $V = V^{N'(k)} \oplus (1 - \overline{N}'(k))V$, the weights of T in $V^{N'(k)}$ and the weights in $(1 - \overline{N}'(k))V$ are distinct; the weights of $V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ and of $V^{N(k)}$ are the same; the image of $\dot{w}V^{N'(k)}$ in $V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ is not 0 if and only if there exists a weight μ in $F(\nu)^{N'}$ such that $w(\mu)$ is a weight of $F(\nu)^N$.

This implies that, for $g \in G(k)$, the image of $gV^{U(k)}$ in $V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ is not 0 if and only if $g \in \overline{P}(k)P_V(k)$.

□

Corollary 3.18. *Let $P' = M'N'$ be another standard parabolic subgroup. The image of $gV^{N'(k)}$ in $V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ is not 0 if and only if $g \in \overline{P}(k)P_V(k)P'(k)$.*

Proof. We have $V^{N'(k)} = \sum_{h \in M'(k)} hV^{U(k)}$ because the right hand side is $N'(k)$-stable and $V^{N'(k)}$ is an irreducible representation of $M'(k)$. □

Remark 3.19. We have $\overline{P}P_V P' = \overline{P}P'$ if and only if $M_V \subset \overline{P}P'$. This is true when V is M-regular or M'-regular. The reverse is true when $P = P'$ but not in general. The property $M_V \subset \overline{P}P'$ can be translated into equivalent properties in the Weyl group: $W_V \subset W_M W_{M'}$, or in the set of simple roots: $\Delta_V \subset \Delta_M \cup \Delta_{M'}$ and any simple root in $\Delta_V \cap \Delta_M$ which is not in $\Delta_{M'}$ is orthogonal to any simple root in $\Delta_V \cap \Delta_{M'}$ which is not in Δ_M.

In our study of Hecke operators we will use the following particular case:

Corollary 3.20. *i. The restriction to $V^{\overline{N}(k)}$ of the quotient map $V \to V_{N(k)}$ is an isomorphism.*

ii. For $g \in G(k)$, the image of $gV^{\overline{N}(k)}$ in $V_{N(k)}$ is not 0 if and only if $g \in P(k)\overline{P}_V(k)\overline{P}(k)$.

4 Representations of $G(F)$

4.1 Notations

Let C be an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic p, let F be a local non archimedean field of finite residue field k of characteristic p and of cardinal q, of ring of integers o_F and uniformizer p_F, and let G be a reductive connected group over F. We fix a minimal parabolic F-subgroup B of G with unipotent radical U and maximal F-split F-subtorus S. The group B has the Levi decomposition $B = ZU$ where Z is the G-centralizer of S. Let $\Phi(S, U)$ be the set of roots of S in U (called positive for U) and $\Delta \subset \Phi(S, U)$ the subset of simple roots. A parabolic k-subgroup P of G containing B is called standard (for U), and has a unique Levi decomposition $P = MN$ with Levi subgroup M containing Z (called standard), and unipotent radical $N = P \cap U$. The group $(M \cap B) = Z(M \cap U)$ is a minimal parabolic F-subgroup of M and $\Delta_M = \Delta \cap \Phi(S, M \cap U)$ are the simple roots of $\Phi(S, M \cap U)$. This determines a bijection between the subsets of Δ, the standard parabolic k-subgroups of G, and their standard Levi subgroups.

The natural homomorphism $v : S(F) \to \mathrm{Hom}(X^*(S), \mathbb{Z})$, where $X^*(S)$ is the group of F-characters of S, extends uniquely to an homomorphism $v : Z(F) \to \mathrm{Hom}(X^*(S), \mathbb{Q})$ with kernel the maximal compact subgroup of $Z(F)$. For a standard Levi subgroup M, we denote by $Z(F)^{+_M}$ the monoid of elements z in $Z(F)$ which are M-positive, i.e.

$$a(v_Z(z)) \geq 0 \text{ for all } a \in \Delta - \Delta_M \quad .$$

When these inequalities are strict, z is called strictly M-positive. Analogously we define the monoid $Z(F)^{-_M}$ of elements in $Z(F)$ which are M-negative, and the strictly M-negative elements.

Let $\overline{B} = Z\overline{U}$ be the opposite parabolic subgroup of B of unipotent radical $\overline{U}$. The standard Levi subgroups for U and for $\overline{U}$ are the same. The roots of S in $\overline{U}$ are the positive roots for $\overline{U}$ and the negative roots for U; the set $\overline{\Delta}$ of simple positive roots for $\overline{U}$ is the set $-\Delta$ of simple negative roots for U. The monoid $Z(F)^{+_M}$ of elements in $Z(F)$ which are M-positive for U is the set of elements in $Z(F)$ which are M-negative for $\overline{U}$.

In the building of the adjoint group G_{ad} over F we choose a special vertex in the apartment attached to S and we write K for the corresponding special parahoric subgroup, as in [HV] 6.1. The quotient of K by its pro-p-radical K_+ is the group of k-points of a connected reductive k-group G_k. The group K/K_+ is $G_k(k)$. For $H = B, S, U, Z, P, M, N$, the image in $G_k(k)$ of $H(F) \cap K$ is the group of k-points of a connected k-group H_k. Note that B_k is a minimal parabolic subgroup of G_k, S_k is a maximal k-split torus in B_k, Z_k being the centralizer of S_k in G_k, is a maximal k-subtorus of B_k, $B_k = Z_k U_k$ is a Levi decomposition, there is a bijection between Δ and the set Δ_k of simple roots of S_k (with respect to U_k), P_k is a standard parabolic subgroup of G_k, of standard Levi subgroup M_k and unipotent radical N_k, the set Δ_{k,M_k} of simple roots of S_k in M_k is the image of Δ_M by the bijection above. We shall usually suppress the indices k from the notation, write $H_0 = H(F) \cap K$. With the notations of the chapter on representations of $G(k)$, we have $T(k) = Z(k)$.

We now fix V an irreducible C-representation of $G(k)$ of parameters (ψ_V, Δ_V) (Definition 3.9), a standard parabolic subgroup $P = MN$ different from G and an element $s \in S(F)$ which is central in $M(F)$ and strictly M-positive.

4.2 $\mathcal{S}'$ is a localisation

We see also V as a smooth C-representation of K, trivial on K_+. We apply Proposition 2.1 to the group $G(F)$, the compact subgroup K, and the closed subgroup $P(F) =$

$M(F)N(F)$. As K is a special parahoric subgroup, the Iwasawa decomposition $G(F) = P(F)K$ is valid. We get a $G(F)$-equivariant linear map

$$I_0 \ : \ \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \ \to \ \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} (\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)}) \tag{6}$$

which satisfies $I_0(bf) = \mathcal{S}'(b) I_0(f)$ for b in $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$, f in $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$, for an algebra homomorphism

$$\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}'_{M,G} : \mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V) \to \mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \tag{7}$$

given by Proposition 2.3. To study the intertwiner I_0, we need to know more about the morphism $\mathcal{S}'$. We use the Satake morphism $\mathcal{S}$ and Proposition 2.4. We denote by $\mathcal{S}'_G$ and $\mathcal{S}_G$ the morphisms $\mathcal{S}'_{Z,G}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{Z,G}$ in Proposition 2.4 when $M = Z$. We analogously define $\mathcal{S}'_M$ and $\mathcal{S}_M$ with a commutative diagram :

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{H}(M, M_0, (V^*)^{N(k)}) \arrow[r, "\mathcal{S}_M"] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{H}(Z, Z_0, (V^*)^{U(k)}) \arrow[d] \\
\mathcal{H}(M, M_0, V_{N(k)})^0 \arrow[r, "{\mathcal{S}'_M}^0"] & \mathcal{H}(Z, Z_0, V_{U(k)})^0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

By Proposition 2.4, the morphism $\mathcal{S}'$ is injective and

$$\mathcal{S}'_G = \mathcal{S}'_M \circ \mathcal{S}' \tag{8}$$

because the Satake morphism $\mathcal{S}$ is injective [HV] and satisfies $\mathcal{S}_G = \mathcal{S}_M \circ \mathcal{S}$ [HV].

We see ψ_{V^*} as a smooth character of Z_0 (Lemma 3.13). Let Z_{V^*} be the stabilizer of ψ_{V^*} in $Z(F)$,

$$Z_{V^*} = \{z \in Z(F)\} \mid \psi_{V^*}(zxz^{-1}) = \psi_{V^*}(x) \ \text{ for all } x \in Z_0 \ \} \ .$$

Proposition 4.1. *The image of the map* $\mathcal{S}'_G : \mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V) \to \mathcal{H}(Z(F), Z_0, V_{U(k)})$ *is equal to* $\mathcal{H}(Z(F)^+ \cap Z_{V^*}, Z_0, V_{U(k)})$.

Proof. The image of $\mathcal{S}_G$ is $\mathcal{H}(Z(F)^- \cap Z_{V^*}, Z_0, (V^*)^{U(k)})$ [HV]. Use Proposition 2.4. □

Analogously, the image of $\mathcal{S}'_M$ is $\mathcal{H}(Z(F)^{+_M} \cap Z_{V^*}, Z_0, V_{U(k)})$.

Definition 4.2. *A ring morphism* $f : A \to B$ *is a localisation at* $b \in B$ *if* f *is injective,* $b \in f(A)$ *is central and invertible in* B*, and* $B = f(A)[b^{-1}]$.

There exists a Hecke operator T_Z central in $\mathcal{H}(Z(F)^+ \cap Z_{V^*}, Z_0, V_{U(k)})$ of support $Z_0 s$ such that $T_Z(s) = 1$, because s is positive and belongs to $S(F)$ contained in Z_{V^*}. The algebra $\mathcal{H}(Z(F)^{+_M} \cap Z_{V^*}, Z_0, V_{U(k)})$ is obtained from the algebra $\mathcal{H}(Z(F)^+ \cap Z_{V^*}, Z_0, V_{U(k)})$ by inverting the Hecke operator T_Z because, for any M-positive element $z \in Z(F)$ there exists a positive integer n such that $s^n z$ belongs to $Z(F)^+$, because $s \in S(F)$ is strictly M-positive.

There exists a unique Hecke operator in $\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)})$ of support $M_0 s$ with value $\text{id}_{V_{N(k)}}$ at s, because s is central in $M(F)$ and contained in Z_{V^*}.

Definition 4.3. *We denote by* T_M *the Hecke operator in* $\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)})$ *with support* $M_0 s$ *and value* $\text{id}_{V_{N(k)}}$ *at* s.

The Hecke operator T_M is central and invertible in $\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)})$; it acts on $\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{\overline{N}(k)}$ by $T_M([1,\overline{v}]_{M_0}) = s^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{M_0}$ for $v \in V$.

We also denote by T_M the $G(F)$-homomorphism of $\text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)})$, such that $T_M(f)(g) = T_M(f(g))$ for $f \in \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)})$ and $g \in G(F)$.

Using Proposition 2.3 we see that

$$\mathcal{S}'_M(T_M) = T_Z \ , \tag{9}$$

because $(U \cap M)(F)z \cap M_0 s = ((U \cap M)(F)zs^{-1} \cap M_0)s = (U_0 \cap M_0)zs^{-1}$ if $zs^{-1} \in Z_0$ and is 0 otherwise. The Hecke operator T_M belongs to the image of $\mathcal{S}'$, because T_Z belongs to the image of $\mathcal{S}'_G$ by construction, $\mathcal{S}'$ is injective and we have (9) , (8). We have shown:

Proposition 4.4. *The map $\mathcal{S}'$ is a localisation at T_M.*

In (6), we consider the map I_0 as a $C[T]$-linear map, T acting on the left side by $(\mathcal{S}')^{-1}(T_M)$ and on the right side by T_M. By Proposition 4.4, the localisation of I_0 at T is the $G(F)$ and $\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)})$-equivariant map

(10)

$$\Theta \ : \ \mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V),\mathcal{S}'} \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \ \to \ \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)}) \ .$$

We will prove that the localisation of I_0 at T is an isomorphism when V is M-coregular. With Proposition 4.4 this implies our main theorem :

Theorem 4.5. *Θ is injective, and Θ is surjective if and only if V is M-coregular.*

4.3 Decomposition of the intertwiner

To go further, following Herzig, we write the intertwiner I_0 as a composite of two $G(F)$-equivariant linear maps

(11)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)} \arrow[dr, "\zeta"] & \\
\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \arrow[ur, "\xi"] \arrow[rr, "I_0"'] & & \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)})
\end{tikzcd}$$

which we now define. In this diagram, $\mathcal{P}$ is the inverse image in K of $P(k)$; it is a parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$ with an Iwahori decomposition with respect to M,

$$\mathcal{P} = N_0 M_0 \overline{N}_{0,+} \ \ , \ \ \overline{N}_{0,+} := \overline{N}(F) \cap K_+ \ . \tag{12}$$

The transitivity of the compact induction implies that

$$\text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)} = \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{P(k)}^{G(k)} V_{N(k)}) \ . \tag{13}$$

Definition 4.6. *The map ξ is the image by the compact induction functor* c-Ind_K^G *of the natural embedding $V \to \text{c-Ind}_{P(k)}^{G(k)} V_{N(k)}$. For $v \in V$, $\xi([1,v]_K)$ is the function in* $\text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}$ *of support contained in K and value $[1,\overline{kv}]_{\mathcal{P}}$ at $k \in K$.*

The map ζ sends $[1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}}$, for $v \in V$, to the function in $\text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)})$ *of support contained in $P(F)\mathcal{P} = P(F)\overline{N}_{0,+}$ and is the constant function with value $[1,\overline{v}]_{M_0}$ on $\overline{N}_{0,+}$.*

Remark 4.7. Later we will use that, for $g \in G(F)$, $\zeta(g^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}})$ has support in $P(F)\mathcal{P}g$ which contains 1 if and only if $g \in \mathcal{P}P(F)$. Consequently, for $f \in \text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}$, the element $\zeta(f)(1)$ depends only on the restriction of f to $\mathcal{P}P(F)$.

Lemma 4.8. *$I_0 = \zeta \circ \xi$.*

Proof. This is clear on the definitions of I_0, ξ, ζ. □

Lemma 4.9. *The map ξ is injective.*

Proof. As V is irreducible and $V_{N(k)} \neq 0$, the map $V \to \text{c-Ind}_{P(k)}^{G(k)} V_{N(k)}$ is injective. As the functor c-Ind_K^G is exact, the map ξ is injective. □

As $P \neq G$, we have

$$\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \not\simeq \text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)} \ ,$$

hence ξ is not surjective.

5 Hecke operators

In this chapter we introduce Hecke operators associated to our fixed element $s \in S(F)$ central in $M(F)$ and strictly M-positive, and we show the compatibility of these Hecke operators with the maps $\xi, \zeta, \mathcal{S}'$ (sometimes we need to suppose that V is M-coregular).

The space of $G(F)$-equivariant homomorphisms from $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ to $\text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}$, is isomorphic to the space $\mathcal{H}(G(F), \mathcal{P}, K, V, V_{N(k)})$ of functions $\Phi : G(F) \to \text{Hom}_C(V, V_{N(k)})$ satisfying

(i) $\Phi(jgj') = j \circ \Phi \circ j'$ for $j \in \mathcal{P}, j' \in K$,

(ii) Φ vanishes outside finitely many double cosets $\mathcal{P}gK$.

We call Φ an Hecke operator. We shall usually use the same notation for the Hecke operator and for the corresponding $G(F)$-equivariant homomorphism, defined by: for all $v \in V$,

$$[1, v]_K \to \sum_{g \in \mathcal{P}\backslash G(F)} g^{-1}[1, \Phi(g)(v)]_{\mathcal{P}} \ . \tag{14}$$

The map ξ corresponds to the Hecke operator of support K and value at 1 the projection $v \mapsto \overline{v} : V \to V_{N(k)}$.

In the same way, the space of $G(F)$-equivariant homomorphisms $\text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)} \to \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$, corresponds to a space $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, \mathcal{P}V_{N(k)}, V)$ of functions $G(F) \to \text{Hom}_C(V_{N(k)}, V)$.

5.1 Definition of Hecke operators

Definition 5.1. *We denote by T_G the Hecke operator in $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$ with support KsK such that $T_G(s) \in \text{End}_C(V)$ is the natural projector of image $V^{\overline{N}(k)}$, factorizing by the quotient map $V \to V_{N(k)}$ (Proposition 3.15).*

This Hecke operator exists ([HV] 7.3 Lemma 1), because $s \in S(F)$ is positive and belongs to Z_{V*}. The Hecke operator T_M could have been defined in the same way as T_G. We shall prove later that $\mathcal{S}'(T_G) = T_M$ when V is M-coregular.

We define now Hecke operators $T_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $\mathcal{H}(G(F), \mathcal{P}, V_{N(k)})$ and $T_{K,\mathcal{P}}$ in $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, \mathcal{P}, V_{N(k)}, V)$ generalizing the Hecke operators T_G and T_M.

Proposition 5.2. *(i) There exists a unique Hecke operator $T_{\mathcal{P}}$ in $\mathcal{H}(G(F),\mathcal{P},V_{N(k)})$ with support $\mathcal{P}s\mathcal{P}$ and value at s the identity of $V_{N(k)}$.*

(ii) There exists a unique Hecke operator $T_{K,\mathcal{P}}$ in $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,\mathcal{P},V_{N(k)},V)$ with support $Ks\mathcal{P}$ such that $T_{K,\mathcal{P}}(s):V_{N(k)}\to V$ is given by the isomorphism $\varphi: V_{N(k)}\to V^{\overline{N}(k)}$ deduced from Proposition 3.15.

Proof. (i) By the condition (i) for Hecke operators, it suffices to check that for $h,h'\in\mathcal{P}$, the relation $hs=sh'$ implies that the actions of h and of h' on $V_{N(k)}$ are the same. By the Iwahori decomposition (12) of $\mathcal{P}$, we have

$$s\mathcal{P}s^{-1}=sN_0M_0\overline{N}_{0+}s^{-1}=sN_0s^{-1}M_0sN_{0+}s^{-1} \tag{15}$$

as s is central in $M(F)$, and h and h' have the same component in M_0.

(ii) It suffices to check that for $h\in K, h'\in\mathcal{P}$, the relation $hs=sh'$ implies that $h'(\varphi(\overline{v}))=\varphi(h(\overline{v}))$ for all $v\in V$. As s is central in $M(F)$ and strictly M-positive we have

$$s\mathcal{P}s^{-1}\subset N_{0+}M_0s\overline{N}_{0+}s^{-1} \quad\text{and}\quad K\cap s\mathcal{P}s^{-1}\subset N_{0+}M_0\overline{N}_0. \tag{16}$$

The elements $h\in N_{0+}M_0\overline{N}_0$ and h' have the same component in M_0. ☐

5.2 Compatibilities between Hecke operators

In this section, we prove the following result:

Proposition 5.3. *i. The left diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \arrow[r, "\xi"] \arrow[d, "T_G"'] & \text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)} \arrow[dl, "T_{K,\mathcal{P}}"'] & & \text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)} \arrow[dl, "T_{K,\mathcal{P}}"'] \arrow[d, "T_{\mathcal{P}}"] \\
\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V & & \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \arrow[r, "\xi"'] & \text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{17}$$

is commutative; the right diagram is commutative when V is M-coregular.

ii. The diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)} \arrow[r, "\zeta"] \arrow[d, "T_{\mathcal{P}}"'] & \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)}) \arrow[d, "T_M"] \\
\text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)} \arrow[r, "\zeta"'] & \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)})
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative.

iii. $\mathcal{S}'(T_G)=T_M$ when V is M-coregular.

By (14), the $G(F)$-homomorphisms corresponding to $\xi, T_G, T_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $T_{K,\mathcal{P}}$, satisfy: for $v\in V$,

$$\xi:\ [1,v]_K\mapsto\sum_{g\in\mathcal{P}\backslash K} g^{-1}[1,\overline{gv})]_{\mathcal{P}}\ ,$$

$$T_G:\ [1,v]_K\mapsto\sum_{g\in K\backslash KsK} g^{-1}[1,T_G(g)(v)]_K\ ,$$

$$T_{\mathcal{P}}:\ [1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}}\to\sum_{g\in\mathcal{P}\backslash\mathcal{P}s\mathcal{P}} g^{-1}[1,T_{\mathcal{P}}(g)(\overline{v})]_{\mathcal{P}}\ ,$$

$$T_{K,\mathcal{P}}:\ [1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}}\mapsto\sum_{g\in K\backslash Ks\mathcal{P}} g^{-1}[1,T_{K,\mathcal{P}}(g)(\overline{v})]_K\ .$$

The formula for $T_{\mathcal{P}}$ and for $T_{K,\mathcal{P}}$ simplify, using (12):

$$\mathcal{P}s\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}s\overline{N}_{0+} \quad \text{and} \quad Ks\mathcal{P} = Ks\overline{N}_{0+} \ , \tag{18}$$

and, for g in $s\overline{N}_{0+}$, we have $T_{\mathcal{P}}(g)(\overline{v}) = \overline{v}$ and $T_{K,\mathcal{P}}(g)(\overline{v}) = \varphi(\overline{v})$ by the property (i) of the Hecke operators, because this is true for $g = s$ and $\overline{N}_{0+}$ acts trivially on $V_{N(k)}$.

The formula for T_G also simplifies: clearly the surjective map $h \mapsto sh : K \to sK$ induces a bijection

$$(K \cap s^{-1}Ks)\backslash K \to K\backslash KsK \ .$$

We remark that $K \cap s^{-1}Ks$ is contained in $\mathcal{P}$ ([HV] 6.13 Proposition) and that the inclusion $\overline{N}_{0+} \subset \mathcal{P}$ induces a bijection

$$s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_{0,+} \to (K \cap s^{-1}Ks)\backslash\mathcal{P} \ .$$

This is a consequence of the Iwahori decomposition (12) and of the fact that s is strictly M-positive. The group $\overline{N}_{0,+}$ acts trivially on V and $T_G(s)(v) = \varphi(\overline{v})$ for $v \in V$.

We deduce that:

$$T_{\mathcal{P}} : \ [1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}} \mapsto \sum_{\overline{n} \in s^{-1}\overline{N}_{0+}s\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}} \ , \tag{19}$$

$$T_{K,\mathcal{P}} : \ [1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}} \mapsto \sum_{\overline{n} \in s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,\varphi(\overline{v})]_K \ , \tag{20}$$

$$T_G : \ [1,v]_K \mapsto \sum_{h \in \mathcal{P}\backslash K} h^{-1} \sum_{\overline{n} \in s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,\varphi(\overline{hv})]_K \ . \tag{21}$$

$T_{\mathcal{P}}([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}})$ is the function in c-$\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}$ of support $\mathcal{P}s\mathcal{P}$ equal to $\overline{v}$ on $s\overline{N}_{0+}$,
$T_{K,\mathcal{P}}([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}})$ is the function in c-$\mathrm{Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ of support $Ks\mathcal{P}$ equal to $\varphi(v)$ on $s\overline{N}_{0+}$.
$T_G([1,v]_K)$ is the function in c-$\mathrm{Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ of support contained in KsK equal to $\varphi(\overline{hv})$ on sh for all $h \in K$.

We see on these formula that the left diagram in i is commutative :

$$T_G = T_{K,\mathcal{P}} \circ \xi \ . \tag{22}$$

When v lies in $V^{\overline{N}(k)}$, φ disappears from the formula of $T_{K,\mathcal{P}}([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}})$, because $\varphi(\overline{v}) = v$, hence:

$$T_{K,\mathcal{P}}([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}}) = \sum_{\overline{n} \in s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_K \ . \tag{23}$$

Remark 5.4. When $v \in V^{\overline{U}(k)}$ and $g \in G(k)$ we have $\overline{gv} \neq 0$ if and only if $g \in \overline{P}(k)\overline{P}_V(k)$ (Corollary 3.20). We have $\overline{P}(k)\overline{P}_V(k) = M(k)\overline{P}_V(k)$. The inverse image in K of $\overline{P}_V(k)$ is a parahoric subgroup $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_V$ acting on $V^{\overline{U}(k)}$ by a character that we still denote $\overline{\psi}_V$. For $h \in \overline{P}_V(k)$ we have $hv = \overline{\psi}_V(h)v$ and $\varphi(hv) = \overline{\psi}_V(h)v$. In the formula for $\xi([1,v]_K)$ or $T_G([1,v]_K)$, we can replace the sum over $\mathcal{P}\backslash K$ by a sum over $\mathcal{P} \cap \overline{\mathcal{P}}_V\backslash\overline{\mathcal{P}}_V$, and we obtain for $v \in V^{\overline{U}(k)}$:

$$\xi([1,v]_K) = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{P}\cap\overline{\mathcal{P}}_V\backslash\overline{\mathcal{P}}_V} \overline{\psi}_V(h)h^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}} \ , \tag{24}$$

$$T_G([1,v]_K) = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{P}\cap\overline{\mathcal{P}}_V\backslash\overline{\mathcal{P}}_V} \overline{\psi}_V(h)h^{-1} \sum_{\overline{n} \in s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,v]_K \ . \tag{25}$$

Under the restriction that V is M-coregular and when $v \in V^{\overline{N}(k)}$, the image of $hV^{\overline{N}(k)}$ in $V_{N(k)}$ is 0 when $h \in K$ does not belong to $\mathcal{P}\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ (Corollary 3.20). This vanishing simplifies the formula of $\xi([1,v]_K)$ and of $T_G([1,v]_K)$, because the sum on h in $\mathcal{P}\backslash K$ can be replaced by a sum on $\overline{n}$ in $\overline{N}_{0,+}\backslash\overline{N}_0$; for T_G the two sums unite in a sum on $s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_0$; moreover using that $\overline{N}_0$ acts trivially on V, when v lies in $V^{\overline{N}(k)}$ we have $\overline{n}v = v = \varphi(\overline{v})$, hence under our hypothesis on (v,V) :

$T_G([1,v]_K)$ is the function in c-$\mathrm{Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ of support contained in $Ks\overline{N}_0$ equal to v on $s\overline{N}_0$,

$$\xi([1,v]_K) = \sum_{\overline{n}\in\overline{N}_{0+}\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}} \ , \tag{26}$$

$$T_G([1,v]_K) = \sum_{\overline{n}\in s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,v]_K \ . \tag{27}$$

(28)
$$(\xi\circ T_{K,\mathcal{P}})([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}}) = \sum_{\overline{n}\in s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1} \sum_{\overline{n}'\in\overline{N}_{0+}\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}'^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}} = \sum_{\overline{n}\in s\overline{N}_{0+}s^{-1}\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,\overline{v})]_{\mathcal{P}} \ .$$

Comparing (19) and (28) we see that :

$$T_{\mathcal{P}} = \xi\circ T_{K,\mathcal{P}} \ . \tag{29}$$

When V is M-coregular, the right diagram in i is commutative.

Remark 5.5. When $v \in V^{\overline{N}(k)}$ and V is M-coregular, we compute easily:

$$(\xi\circ T_G)([1,v]_K) = \sum_{\overline{n}\in s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1} \sum_{\overline{n}'\in\overline{N}_{0+}\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}'^{-1}[1,\overline{v})]_{\mathcal{P}} = \sum_{\overline{n}\in s^{-1}\overline{N}_{0+}s\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,\overline{v})]_{\mathcal{P}} \ ,$$

$$(T_{\mathcal{P}}\circ\xi)([1,v]_K) = \sum_{\overline{n}\in\overline{N}_{0+}\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}^{-1} \sum_{\overline{n}'\in s^{-1}\overline{N}_{0+}s\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}'^{-1}s^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}} = \sum_{\overline{n}\in s^{-1}\overline{N}_{0+}s\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}} \ ,$$

$$(T_{K,\mathcal{P}}\circ\xi)([1,v]_K) = \sum_{\overline{n}\in\overline{N}_{0+}\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}'^{-1} \sum_{\overline{n}\in s^{-1}\overline{N}_0 s\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,v]_K = \sum_{\overline{n}\in s^{-1}\overline{N}_{0+}s\backslash\overline{N}_0} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_K \ ,$$

We consider now the diagram ii. with ζ, without restriction on V. We have

$$\zeta\circ T_{\mathcal{P}} = T_M\circ\zeta \tag{30}$$

because :

$(T_M\circ\zeta)([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}})$ is the function $f_{\overline{v}}$ of support $P\overline{N}_{0+}$ and constant on $\overline{N}_{0+}$ with value $s^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{M_0}$, because $\zeta([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}})$ is the function $f_{\overline{v}}$ of support $P\overline{N}_{0+}$ and constant on $\overline{N}_{0+}$ with value $[1,\overline{v}]_{M_0}$, and $T_M([1,\overline{v}]_{M_0}) = s^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{M_0}$.

By (19), $(\zeta\circ T_{\mathcal{P}})([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}}) = \sum_{\overline{n}\in s^{-1}\overline{N}_{0+}s\backslash\overline{N}_{0+}} \overline{n}^{-1}s^{-1}\zeta([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}})$. Hence $(\zeta\circ T_{\mathcal{P}})([1,\overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}})$ is also the function $f_{\overline{v}}$ of support $P\overline{N}_{0+}$ and constant on $\overline{N}_{0+}$ with value $s^{-1}[1,\overline{v}]_{M_0}$.

Proof of iii. We proved that $\xi\circ T_{\mathcal{P},K} = T_{\mathcal{P}}$ when V is M-coregular. As in general $T_{\mathcal{P},K}\circ\xi = T_G$, one deduces $\xi\circ T_G = T_{\mathcal{P}}\circ\xi$. As we always have $\zeta\circ T_{\mathcal{P}} = T_M\circ\zeta$, we obtain

$$\zeta\circ\xi\circ T_G = \zeta\circ T_{\mathcal{P}}\circ\xi = T_M\circ\zeta\circ\xi \ ,$$

i.e. $I_0 \circ T_G = T_M \circ I_0$. This implies $\mathcal{S}'(T_G) = T_M$.

This ends the proof of Proposition 5.3.

We can have $\mathcal{S}'(T_G) = T_M$ even when the representation V is not M-coregular. The trivial representation V is never M-coregular because $M \neq G$.

Remark 5.6. *For any choice of $s \in M(F)$ strictly M-positive we have $\mathcal{S}'(T_G) = T_M$, when $G = GL(2, F)$, $B = P = MN$ the upper triangular subgroup, M the diagonal subgroup, $K = GL(2, o_F)$ and V the trivial representation of $GL(2, k)$.*

Proof. For $t \in M(F)$, the value of $\mathcal{S}'(1_{KsK})$ at t is the image in C of the integer

$$n_s(t) := |\{b \in F/o_F \ \mid \ n_b t \text{ in } KsK\}| \quad , \quad n_b := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} .$$

The integer $n_s(t)$ depends only on sM_0. We claim that $n_s(s) = 1$ and $n_s(t) \equiv 0$ modulo p for t not in sM_0; this implies $\mathcal{S}'(T_G) = T_M$. It suffices to check that the claim is true for s_p^n with

$$s_p := \begin{pmatrix} p_F & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $n > 1$, because s belongs to $\cup_{n>1} Z(G) M_0 s_p^n$ where $Z(G)$ is the center of $G(F)$.

It is well known that the double coset Ks_pK is a disjoint union of the $p+1$ cosets Ks_p and $K \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a \\ 0 & p_F \end{pmatrix}$ for a in system of representatives of $o_F/p_F o_F$, and more generally $Ks_p^n K$ is a disjoint union of the cosets $K \begin{pmatrix} p_F^u & a \\ 0 & p_F^r \end{pmatrix}$ for $a \in o_F/p_F^r o_F$ and for $u, r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $u + r = n$. It is more convenient to write

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_F^u & a \\ 0 & p_F^r \end{pmatrix} = n_c s_{p^{u,r}} \quad \text{with} \quad s_{p^{u,r}} := \begin{pmatrix} p_F^u & 0 \\ 0 & p_F^r \end{pmatrix}$$

for $c = a p_F^{-r} \in p_F^{-r} o_F / o_F$.

As $n_b t$ and the representatives $n_c s_{p^{u,r}}$ of the cosets $K \backslash K s_p K$ all belong to $B(F)$, $n_{s_p^n}(t)$ is also the number of $b \in F/o_F$ such that $n_b t \in \cup_{c,u,r} M_0 N_0 n_c s_{p^{u,r}}$. Hence $n_{s_p^n}(t) \neq 0$ is equivalent to $t \in M_0 s_{p^{u,r}}$ and in this case

$$n_{s_p^n}(t) = n_{s_p^n}(s_{p^{u,r}}) = |p_F^{-r} o_F / o_F| = q^r$$

is equal to 1 if $t \in M_0 s_p^n$ and is divisible by p otherwise. □

6 Main theorem

The main theorem is a corollary of the following proposition :

Proposition 6.1. *The map ξ is injective; when V is M-coregular, the image of ξ contains $T_{\mathcal{P}}(\text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)})$.*

The kernel of the map ζ is the $T_{\mathcal{P}}^{\infty}$-torsion part of $\text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}$ and the representation $\text{c-Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)})$ is generated by

$$(T_M^{-n} \circ \zeta)([1, \overline{v}]_{\mathcal{P}}) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}$$

for any fixed non-zero element $\overline{v} \in V_{N(k)}$.

For the map ξ, the proposition follows from (Lemma 4.9) and (29). The next three lemma will be used in the proof for the map ζ.

Lemma 6.2. *The map ζ is injective on the set of functions $f \in \text{c-Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}$ with support in $\mathcal{P}Z(F)^{+M}K$.*

Proof. Let f such that $\zeta(f) = 0$ with support in $\mathcal{P}Z(F)^+K$. We claim that $f = 0$ on $\mathcal{P}P(F)$. This implies that $f = 0$ because $G(F) = P(F)K$ and for $k \in K$ the function $k^{-1}f$ satisfies the same conditions as f. To prove the claim, we use only that $\zeta(f)(1) = 0$ in $\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)}$. As $\zeta(f)(1)$ depends only on the restriction of f to $\mathcal{P}P(F)$, we assume as we may, that the support of f is contained in $\mathcal{P}P(F)$. The support of f is a finite disjoint union of $\mathcal{P}z_ik_i$ for $z_i \in Z(F)^+$ and $k_i \in K$, with $z_ik_i \in \mathcal{P}P(F)$. We have $\mathcal{P}P(F) = \overline{N}_{0,+}P(F)$ hence $k_i \in z_i^{-1}\overline{N}_{0,+}z_iP(F)$. As z_i is positive, $z_i^{-1}\overline{N}_{0,+}z_i \subset \overline{N}_{0,+}$. This implies that we can suppose $k_i \in P(F) \cap K$. As $P(F) \cap K = N_0M_0$ and z_i is positive, we can suppose $k_i \in M_0$. We proved that the support of f is a finite disjoint union of $\mathcal{P}z_ik_i$ for $z_i \in Z(F)^+$ and $k_i \in M_0$. Taking the intersection with $M(F)$, the sets $M(F) \cap \mathcal{P}z_ik_i$ are also disjoint. Writing

$$f = \sum_i (z_ik_i)^{-1}[1, \overline{v}_i])_{\mathcal{P}}$$

we have $\zeta(f)(1) = \sum_i (z_ik_i)^{-1}[1, \overline{v}_i]_{M_0}$, and $\zeta(f)(1) = 0$ is equivalent to $\overline{v}_i = 0$ for all i.

□

Lemma 6.3. *(i) A basis of the open compact subsets of the compact space $P(F)\backslash G(F)$ is given by the $G(F)$-translates of $P(F)\backslash P(F)\overline{N}_{0,+}s^n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

(ii) For any subset $X \subset G(F)$ with finite image in $\mathcal{P}\backslash G(F)$ there exists a large integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s^nX \subset \mathcal{P}Z(F)^{+M}K$.

Proof. See Herzig [Herzig] Lemma 2.20.

(i) The compact space $P(F)\backslash G(F)$ is the union of the right $G(F)$-translates of the big cell $P(F)\backslash P(F)\overline{N}(F)$ which is open, the $s^{-n}\overline{N}_{0,+}s^n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ form a decreasing sequence of open subgroups of $\overline{N}(F)$ converging to 1.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the normalizer of S in G and let $\mathcal{B}$ be the inverse image of $B(k)$ in K (an Iwahori subgroup). Then $(G(F), \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}(F))$ is a generalized Tits system [HV]. We have:

a) $G(F) = \mathcal{B}\mathcal{N}(F)\mathcal{B}$,

b) for $\nu \in \mathcal{N}(F)$ there a finite subset X_ν in $\mathcal{N}(F)$ such that, for all $\nu' \in \mathcal{N}(F)$, we have

$$\nu'\mathcal{B}\nu \subset \cup_{x \in X_\nu} \mathcal{B}\nu'x\mathcal{B} \ .$$

c) As the parahoric group K is special, for any $\nu \in \mathcal{N}(F)$ there exists $z \in Z(F)$ such that $\nu K = zK$ because K contains representatives of the Weyl group.

We deduce from a) and c) that $G(F) = \mathcal{B}Z(F)K$. We write, as we may, X as a finite union $X = \cup_i \mathcal{P}z_ik_i$ with $z_i \in Z(F), k_i \in K$. We deduce from b) that, for any index i, there are finitely many $n_{i,j} \in \mathcal{N}(F)$ such that $z\mathcal{B}z_i \subset \cup_j \mathcal{B}zn_{i,j}\mathcal{B}$ for all $z \in Z(F)$. It follows that

$$z\mathcal{P}z_ik_i \subset P_0z\overline{N}_{0,+}z_ik_i \subset \cup_j \mathcal{P}zn_{i,j}K$$

as $\overline{N}_{0,+} \subset \mathcal{B}$. We choose $z_{i,j} \in Z(F)$ such that $z_{i,j}K = n_{i,j}K$, as we may by c). There exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s^nz_{i,j} \in Z(F)^{+M}$ for all i, j. Hence $s^nX \subset \cup_j \mathcal{P}s^nz_{i,j}K \subset \mathcal{P}Z(F)^{+M}K$.

□

Let σ be a smooth C-representation of $M(F)$. For any non-zero $y \in \sigma$, there exists a function $f_y \in \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \sigma$ of support $P(F)\overline{N}_{0,+}$ and value y on $\overline{N}_{0+}$ because the multiplication $P(F) \times \overline{N}_{0+} \to P(F)\overline{N}_{0,+}$ is an homeomorphism.

Lemma 6.4. *Let σ be a smooth C-representation of $M(F)$ generated by an element x. Then the representation $\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}\sigma$ is generated by the functions $f_{s^{-n}x}$ of support $P(F)\overline{N}_{0,+}$ and value $s^{-n}x$ on $\overline{N}_{0+}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.3, we reduce to show that any function $f_{n,mx} \in \mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}\sigma$ of support contained in $P(F)\overline{N}_{0,+}s^n$ equal to mx on $\overline{N}_{0+}s^n$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in M(F)$, is contained in the subrepresentation generated by $f_{s^{-r}x}$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$. The function $m^{-1}f_{n,mx}$ has support in $P(F)\backslash P(F)\overline{N}_{0+}s^n$ and value $s^{-n}x$ on the compact open subset $m^{-1}s^{-n}\overline{N}_{0+}s^n m$ of $\overline{N}(F)$; this set is a finite disjoint union of $s^{-n'}\overline{N}_{0+}s^{n'}\overline{n}$ with $\overline{n} \in \overline{N}(F)$ and $n' \in \mathbb{N}$. For a non-zero $y \in \sigma$, the function $(s^{n'}\overline{n})^{-1}f_y \in \mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}\sigma$ has support $P(F)\overline{N}_{0+}s^{n'}\overline{n}$ and value $s^{-n'}y$ on $s^{-n'}\overline{N}_{0+}s^{n'}\overline{n}$. The sum of $(s^{n'}\overline{n})^{-1}f_{s^{n'-n}x}$ is equal to $m^{-1}f_{n,mx}$. □

To analyse the image of ζ, we take in Lemma 6.4 the representation $\sigma = \text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)}$ generated by $x = [1,\overline{v}]_{M_0}$, for any non-zero fixed $\overline{v} \in V_{N(k)}$, and we note that for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, by definition 4.3 and 4.6,

$$(T_M^n \circ \zeta)([1,\overline{v}]_{\overline{\mathcal{P}}}) = f_{s^{-n}x}.$$

We obtain that the representation $\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)})$ is generated by the elements $(T_M^n \circ \zeta)([1,\overline{v}]_{\overline{\mathcal{P}}}))$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

We consider now an element f in the kernel of ζ. The function f vanishes outside of a compact set X of finite image in $\mathcal{P}\backslash G(F)$. We choose the integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s^n X \subset \mathcal{P}Z(F)^+K$ (Lemma 6.3 ii). The support of $T_{\mathcal{P}}^n$ is $\mathcal{P}s^n\mathcal{P}$ by (12) and the positivity of s. The support of $T_{\mathcal{P}}^n(f)$ is contained in $\mathcal{P}s^nX$ hence in $\mathcal{P}Z(F)^+K$. By Lemma 6.2, we conclude that $T_{\mathcal{P}}^n(f) = 0$. This ends the proof of Proposition 6.1.

Corollary 6.5. *The kernel of $I_0 = \zeta\circ\xi$ is the space of $T_{\mathcal{P}}^\infty$-torsion elements in* $\text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ *identified via ξ to a subspace of* $\text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_K^{G(F)}\,\text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_{P(k)}^{G(k)} V_{N(k)}$.

In the diagram (11) the representations are $C[T]$-modules, where T acts as on the middle space by $T_{K,\mathcal{P}}$, on the right space by T_M and on the left space by $(\mathcal{S}')^{-1}(T_M)$. Proposition 5.3 tells us that:

The map ζ is $C[T]$-linear.

When V is M-coregular, the map ξ is $C[T]$-linear and $(\mathcal{S}')^{-1}(T_M) = T_G$.

Corollary 6.6. *i. The T-localisation ζ_T of ζ is an isomorphism.*

ii. When V is M-coregular, the T-localisation ξ_T of ξ is an isomorphism.

The map Θ is the T-localisation of $I_0 = \zeta\circ\xi$. By i., the map $\Theta = \zeta_T \circ \xi_T$ is an isomorphism if and only if ξ_T is an isomorphism. The map Θ is always injective (as ξ is injective) and is surjective if and only if ξ_T is surjective.

We prove now the converse of Corollary 6.6 ii.

Proposition 6.7. *When ξ_T is surjective, V is M-coregular.*

Proof. 1) Set $\tau_G := {\mathcal{S}'}^{-1}(T_M)$. Par definition, $I_0 \circ \tau_G = T_M \circ I_0$, hence

$$\zeta\circ\xi\circ\tau_G = T_M\circ\zeta\circ\xi = \zeta\circ T_{\mathcal{P}}\circ\xi$$

As the localisation T of ζ is injective, $\xi\circ\tau_G = T_{\mathcal{P}}\circ\xi$ modulo $T_{\mathcal{P}}^\infty$-torsion.

2) The surjectivity of ξ_T means that for all $f \in \text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathcal{P}}^{G(F)} V_{N(k)}$ there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_{\mathcal{P}}^n(f)$ belongs in the image of ξ (one can change n by any $n' \geq n$). As the representation is generated by $[1,x]_{\mathcal{P}}$ for $x \in V_{N(k)}$, the hypothesis is that exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_{\mathcal{P}}^n([1,x]_{\mathcal{P}})$ belongs in the image of ξ for all $x \in V_{N(k)}$. The Hecke operator $T_{\mathcal{P}}^n$ is analogous to the Hecke operator $T_{\mathcal{P}}$ but associated to s^n instead of s. Replacing s by s^n we can work under the hypothesis: $T_{\mathcal{P}}([1,x]_{\mathcal{P}})$ belongs in the image of ξ for all $x \in V_{N(k)}$.

3) The support of $T_{\mathcal{P}}([1,x]_{\mathcal{P}})$ is contained in $\mathcal{P}s\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}s\overline{N}_{0+}$ and if

$$T_{\mathcal{P}}([1,x]_{\mathcal{P}}) = \xi(f) \tag{31}$$

for some $f \in \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$, the support of f must be contained in $Ks\mathcal{P} = Ks\overline{N}_{0+}$. Writing $Ks\mathcal{P}$ as a disjoint union of cosets $Ks\overline{n}_i$ with $\overline{n}_i \in \overline{N}_{0+}$, and $f = \sum_i (s\overline{n}_i)^{-1}[1, v_i]_K$ for a choice of non-zero $v_i \in V$ and a finite set of indices i. The equality (31) means that, for each index i, v_i satisfies the two conditions a) and b): for any k in K,

a) if $ks\overline{n}_i \in \mathcal{P}s\mathcal{P}$, i.e. $ks\overline{n}_i = hs\overline{n}$ with $h \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\overline{n} \in \overline{N}_{0+}$, then $\overline{kv_i} = hx$,

b) if $ks\overline{n}_i \notin \mathcal{P}s\mathcal{P}$ then $\overline{kv_i} = 0$.

4) We show that the condition a) implies that $v_i = \varphi(x)$ where $\varphi(x) \in V^{\overline{N}(k)}$ lifts x.

We have $k = hs\overline{n}\overline{n}_i^{-1}s^{-1}$ and $s\overline{n}\overline{n}_i^{-1}s^{-1} \in \overline{N}(F) \cap K = \overline{N}_0$, hence $h \in \mathcal{P}\overline{N}_0$. Conversely if $k = h\nu$ with $h \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\nu \in \overline{N}_0$, then $ks\overline{n}_i = hss^{-1}\nu s\overline{n}_i$ and $s^{-1}\nu s \in N_{0+}$ because s is strictly M-positive. The condition a) means that for any $h \in \mathcal{P}$ and any $\nu \in \overline{N}_0$ we have $\overline{h\nu v_i} = hx$. As $h \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $\overline{h\nu v_i} = h\overline{\nu v_i}$ and the condition a) is equivalent to $\overline{\nu v_i} = x$ for all $\nu \in \overline{N}_0$. Writing $v_i = \varphi(x) + w_i$, the $\overline{N}(k)$-submodule W of V generated by w_i is contained in the kernel of $v \mapsto \overline{v}$. If $W \neq 0$ then $W^{\overline{N}(k)} \neq 0$ and we get a contradiction. Hence $W = 0$ and $v_i = \varphi(x)$.

5) We interpret now the condition b) which says that if k does not belong to $\mathcal{P}\overline{N}_0$, then $\overline{k\varphi(x)} = 0$, and this for all $x \in V_{N(k)}$. Hence the image of $gV^{\overline{N}(k)}$ in $V_{N(k)}$ is 0 for all g not belonging to $P(k)\overline{N}(k)$. By Corollary 3.20, this implies

$$P(k)\overline{P}_V(k)\overline{P}(k) \subset P(k)\overline{N}(k)$$

hence the M-coregularity of V by Corollary 3.19. $\square$

This ends the proof of our main theorem (Theorem 4.5).

Remark 6.8. When V has dimension 1 and is given by a character ϵ of K, the map Θ is not surjective because V is not M-coregular as $\overline{P}_V = G \neq \overline{P}$. If there exists a character ϵ_M of $M(F)$ equal to ϵ on M_0 (such a character ϵ_M does not always exist), one can consider the composite of I_0 with the surjective natural map

$$\psi : \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} \epsilon) \to \text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \epsilon_M \ .$$

In the case where ϵ extends to a character ϵ_G of $G(F)$, the image of $\psi \circ I_0$ is the subrepresentation ϵ_G of dimension 1 of $\text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \epsilon_M$. The map $\psi \circ \Theta$ is also non surjective.

But in the case where ϵ does not extend to a character ϵ_G of $G(F)$, the map $\psi \circ \Theta$ can be surjective. For example, $\psi \circ \Theta$ is surjective when $\text{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \epsilon_M$ is irreducible. This is the case, for any choice of ϵ_M, when $G = U(2,1)$ with respect to an unramified quadratic extension of F, B is a Borel subgroup and K is a special non hyperspecial parahoric subgroup [Ramla]; this is also the case when $G(F) = GL(2,D)$ with a quaternion skew field over F, B is the upper triangular subgroup and $K = GL(2,O_D)$ [Ly].

7 Supersingular representations of $G(F)$

We introduce first the notion of K-supersingularity for an irreducible smooth representation π of $G(F)$. Then we recall the notion of supercuspidality. We expect that supercuspidality is equivalent to K-supersingularity, at least for admissible representations. We will give some partial results in this direction. Finally, when π is admissible we give an equivalent definition of K-supersingularity which coincides with the definition given by Herzig and Abe when G is F-split, K is hyperspecial and the characteristic of F is 0.

Let π be an irreducible smooth C-representation of $G(F)$. For any smooth irreducible C-representation V of K, we consider

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$$

as a right module for the Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$.

Remark 7.1. The representation $\pi|_K$ contains an irreducible subrepresentation V, i.e. by adjunction and the irreducibility of π,

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi) \neq 0 \ ,$$

because a non-zero element $v \in \pi$ being fixed by an open subgroup of K, generates a K-stable subspace of finite dimension, and any finite dimensional smooth C-representation of K contains an irreducible subrepresentation.

We recall some elementary facts on localisation.

Let $f : A \to B$ be an injective ring morphism which is a localisation at $b \in f(A)$ central and invertible in $B = f(A)[b^{-1}]$ (Def. 4.2).

A right B-module $\mathcal{V}$ considered as a right A-module via f, is called the restriction of $\mathcal{V}$. An homomorphism φ of right B-modules considered as an homomorphism of right A-modules is called the restriction of φ.

A right A-module $\mathcal{V}$ induces a right B-module $\mathcal{V} \otimes_{A,f} B$, called the localisation of $\mathcal{V}$ at b. An homomorphism φ of right A-modules induces an homomorphism $\varphi \otimes \mathrm{id}$ of B-modules called the localisation of φ at b.

A right A-module where the action of $f^{-1}(b)$ is invertible is canonically a right B-module and the homomorphisms $\mathrm{Hom}_A(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}')$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_B(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}')$ are the same for such A-modules $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V}'$.

Lemma 7.2. *The restriction and the localisation at b are equivalence of categories, inverse to each other, between the category of right B-modules and the category of right A-modules where the action of $f^{-1}(b)$ is invertible.*

Proof. Clear. □

We consider now the localisation

$$\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}'_{M,G} : \mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V) \to \mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)})$$

at T_M (Proposition 4.4).

By Theorem 4.5, the localisation of the left $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$-module $\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$ at T_M is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} V_{N(k)})$ when V is M-coregular.

Definition 7.3. *An irreducible smooth C-representation π of $G(F)$ is called K-supersingular when the localisations of the right $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$-module*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$$

at T_M are 0, for all irreducible smooth C-representations V of K and all standard Levi subgroup $M \neq G$.

For a given M, the condition means that, for any non-zero $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that ${\mathcal{S}'}^{-1}(T_M^n)(f) = 0$. The condition does not depend on the choice of T_M, as it is equivalent to :

$$\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V),\mathcal{S}'} \mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \ , \ \pi) = 0 \ .$$

Definition 7.4. *An irreducible smooth C-representation π of $G(F)$ is called supercuspidal, if π is not isomorphic to a subquotient of* $\text{c-Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}\tau$ *for irreducible smooth C-representation τ of $M(F)$ where $M \neq G$.*

The definition does not depend on the minimal parabolic F-subgroup B of G used to define the standard parabolic subgroups, as all such B's are conjugate in $G(F)$.

Let V be an irreducible smooth C-representation of K and let σ be a smooth C-representation of $M(F)$ for some standard Levi subgroup $M \neq G$. Our first result concerns the T_M-localisation of the right $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$-module

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \operatorname{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \sigma) \ .$$

Proposition 7.5. *i.* $V \subset (\operatorname{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \sigma)|_K$ *if and only if* $V_{N(k)} \subset \sigma|_{M_0}$.

ii. In this case, the action of $\mathcal{S}'^{-1}(T_M)$ *on* $\operatorname{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \operatorname{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \sigma)$ *is invertible.*

Proof. i follows from the Frobenius adjunction isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Hom}_K(V, \operatorname{Ind}_{P_0}^K \sigma) \ \to \ \operatorname{Hom}_{M_0}(V_{N(k)}, \sigma) \ .$$

ii follows from Proposition 2.1. ☐

Our results on the comparison between K-supersingular and supercuspidal irreducible smooth C-representations of $G(F)$ are :

Theorem 7.6. *Let $M \neq G$ be a standard Levi F-subgroup and let τ be an irreducible smooth C-representation of $M(F)$.*

i. An irreducible subrepresentation of $\operatorname{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \tau$ *is not K-supersingular.*

ii. An admissible irreducible quotient of $\operatorname{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \tau$ *is not K-supersingular.*

iii. An admissible irreducible smooth C-representation π of $G(F)$ such that the localisation of the right $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$-module

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$$

at T_M is not 0 for some L-coregular irreducible subrepresentation V of $\pi|_K$ and some standard Levi subgroup $M \subset L \neq G$, is not supercuspidal.

Proof. i. The last proposition implies that an irreducible subrepresentation of $\operatorname{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \tau$ is not K-supersingular.

ii. Let π be an irreducible quotient of $\operatorname{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \tau$. We choose an irreducible smooth C-representation W of M_0 such that the irreducible representation τ is a quotient of $\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} W$. Then π is a quotient of $\operatorname{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M_0}^{M(F)} W)$. We consider the unique irreducible M-coregular representation V of $G(k)$ such that $V_{N(k)} \simeq W$ (Proposition 3.11). By our main theorem (Theorem 4.5):

$$\operatorname{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{M(F)\cap K}^{M(F)} W) \simeq \mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V),\mathcal{S}'} \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \ .$$

we deduce:

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{G(F)}(\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V),\mathcal{S}'} \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \ , \ \pi) \neq 0 \ .$$

Claim: If π is admissible, this implies

$$\mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V),\mathcal{S}'} \operatorname{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi) \neq 0 \ .$$

Hence π is not K-supersingular. The claim follows from elementary algebra and will be proved later 7.7.

iii. The localisation of $\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$ at T_L is not 0 because the localisation of $\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$ at T_M is not 0, by transitivity of the localisation: the localisation at T_M is equal to the localisation at T_M of the localisation at T_L. Equivalently

$$\mathcal{H}_{L,V,\pi} := \mathcal{H}(L(F), L_0, V_{N'(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V),\mathcal{S}'_{L,G}} \mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$$

is not 0 because $\mathcal{H}_{M,V,\pi} \neq 0$. This follows from the transitivity relation

$$\mathcal{H}_{M,V,\pi} = \mathcal{H}(M(F), M_0, V_{N(k)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(L(F),L_0,V_{N'(k)}),\mathcal{S}'_{M,L}} \mathcal{H}_{M,V,\pi}$$

which is deduced from the transitivity $\mathcal{S}'_{M,G} = \mathcal{S}'_{M,L} \circ \mathcal{S}'_{L,G}$.

The non-zero space

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$$

contains a simple right $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$-submodule $\mathcal{N}$ because π is admissible.

The irreducible representation π is a quotient of

$$\mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)} \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V \tag{32}$$

As V is L-coregular, $\mathcal{N}$ is the restriction of a simple $\mathcal{H}(L(F), L_0, V_{N'(k)})$-module, still denoted by $\mathcal{N}$, and the representation (32) is isomorphic to

$$\mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(L(F),L_0,V_{N'(k)})} \mathrm{Ind}_{Q(F)}^{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_{L_0}^{L(F)} V_{N'(k)}) \tag{33}$$

by Theorem 4.5. This last representation is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Ind}_{Q(F)}^{G(F)} \sigma$ where

$$\sigma := \mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(L(F),L_0,V_{N'(k)})} \text{c-Ind}_{L_0}^{L(F)} V_{N'(k)} \ . \tag{34}$$

is a smooth representation of $L(F)$. The center of $L(F)$ embeds naturally in the center of the Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}(L(F), L_0, V_{N'(k)})$ and acts by a character on the simple $\mathcal{H}(L(F), L_0, V_{N'(k)})$-module $\mathcal{N}$ [VigD]. Hence σ has a central character.

The admissible irreducible representation π is a quotient of $\mathrm{Ind}_{Q(F)}^{G(F)} \sigma$ where σ has a central character. By Proposition 7.8 below, π is a quotient of $\mathrm{Ind}_{Q(F)}^{G(F)} \tau$ for an admissible irreducible smooth C-representation τ of $L(F)$. As $Q \neq G$, the representation π is not supercuspidal.

□

Remark 7.7. *Proof of the claim.*

Proof. We denote $A = \mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V), T = T_M \in A, B = A[T^{-1}], X = \text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$. We suppose

$$\mathrm{Hom}_G(B \otimes_A X, \pi) \neq 0 \ ,$$

and we want to prove that $B \otimes_A \mathrm{Hom}_G(X, \pi) \neq 0$ provided that $\mathrm{Hom}_G(X, \pi)$ is finite dimensional (which is the case if π is admissible).

We consider the natural linear map

$$r : \mathrm{Hom}_G(B \otimes_A X, \pi) \to \mathrm{Hom}_G(X, \pi) \ \ , \ \ \varphi \mapsto (x \mapsto \varphi(1 \otimes x)) \ .$$

The space $\mathrm{Hom}_G(B \otimes_A X, \pi)$ is naturally a right B-module hence a right A-module by restriction. The map r is A-linear :

$$r(\varphi a)(x) = (\varphi a)(1 \otimes x) = \varphi(a \otimes x) = \varphi(1 \otimes ax) = r(\varphi)(ax) = (r(\varphi)a)(x) \ ,$$

for $a \in A, x \in X, \varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_G(B \otimes_A X, \pi)$. Consequently, the image $\mathrm{Im}(r)$ is an A-submodule of $\mathrm{Hom}_G(X, \pi)$. We remark that $T \,\mathrm{Im}(r) = \mathrm{Im}(r)$ because $r(\varphi) = r(\varphi T^{-1})T$ for $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_G(B \otimes_A X, \pi)$.

We show now that our hypothesis implies that $\mathrm{Im}(r)$ is not 0. Indeed, let $\varphi \neq 0$ in $\mathrm{Hom}_G(B \otimes_A X, \pi)$. There exists $b \in B$ and $x \in X$ such that $\varphi(b \otimes x) \neq 0$. Writing $b = T^{-n}a$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in A$ we get $\varphi(T^{-n}a \otimes x) = \varphi T^{-n}(1 \otimes ax) \neq 0$ so that $r(\varphi T^{-n}) \neq 0$.

We assume now that $\mathrm{Hom}_G(X, \pi)$ is finite dimensional. Then $\mathrm{Im}(r)$ is also finite dimensional then T induces an automorphism of $\mathrm{Im}(r)$ so that $B \otimes_A \mathrm{Im}(r) \neq 0$. The localisation being an exact functor, $B \otimes_A \mathrm{Hom}_G(X, \pi) \neq 0$.

□

Proposition 7.8. *Let π be an admissible irreducible smooth C-representation of $G(F)$ which is a quotient of $\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \sigma$ for a smooth C-representation σ of $M(F)$ with a central character. Then there exists an admissible irreducible smooth C-representation τ of $M(F)$ such that π is a quotient of $\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \tau$.*

When the characteristic of F is 0, Herzig ([Herzig] Lemma 9.9) proved this proposition using the $\overline{P}$-ordinary functor $\mathrm{Ord}_{\overline{P}}$ introduced by Emerton [Emerton]. His proof contains four steps:

1. As σ is locally Z_M-finite, we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \sigma, \pi) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{M(F)}(\sigma, \mathrm{Ord}_{\overline{P}}\pi) \ .$$

2. As π is admissible, $\mathrm{Ord}_{\overline{P}}\pi$ is admissible.
3. As $\mathrm{Ord}_{\overline{P}}\pi$ is admissible and non-zero, it contains an admissible irreducible subrepresentation τ.
4. As $\mathrm{Ord}_{\overline{P}}$ is the right adjoint of $\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)}$ in the category of admissible representations, we obtain that π is a quotient of $\mathrm{Ind}_{P(F)}^{G(F)} \tau$.

The proof is valid without hypothesis on the characteristic of F : we checked carefully that the Emerton's proof of the steps 1, 2, 4 never uses the characteristic of F. Only the proof of step 3 given by Herzig has to be replaced by a characteristic-free proof.

Lemma 7.9. *An admissible smooth C-representation of $G(F)$ contains an admissible irreducible subrepresentation.*

Proof. For any admissible smooth C-representation of $G(F)$, the dimension of π^H is a positive finite integer for any open pro-p-sugroup H. In a subrepresentation π_1 of π such that the right $\mathcal{H}(G(F), H, \mathrm{id})$-module π_1^H has minimal length, the subrepresentation generated by π_1^H is irreducible. □

This ends the proof of Proposition 7.8 hence of the theorem.

Remark 7.10. When π is an admissible smooth C-representation of G, then

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$$

is finite dimensional hence it is 0 or contains a simple $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$-module.

An irreducible smooth C-representation π of $G(F)$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$ contains a simple $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$-module $\mathcal{N}$, has a central character. This follows from:

1. The center of $\mathcal{H}(G(F), K, V)$ acts on $\mathcal{N}$ by a character [VigD].r
2. π is quotient of $\mathcal{N} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)} \text{c-}\mathrm{Ind}_K^{G(F)} V$.

We want now to show that the K-supersingularity of an admissible irreducible representation of $G(F)$ can also be defined using the characters of the center $\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V)$ of $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)$ appearing in $\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$.

We consider the localisation

$$\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V) \to \mathcal{Z}(M(F),M_0,V_{N(k)}) \ .$$

at T_M obtained by restriction to the centers of the localisation $\mathcal{S}'$ at T_M (Proposition 4.4).

Proposition 7.11. *Let π be an admissible irreducible smooth C-representation of $G(F)$. The following properties are equivalent:*

i. π is K-supersingular,

ii. The localisation at T_M of any simple $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)$-submodule of

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$$

is 0, for all standard Levi subgroups $M \neq G$.

iii. The localisation at T_M of any character of $\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V)$ contained in

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$$

is 0, for all standard Levi subgroups $M \neq G$.

Proof. We suppose first π only irreducible and we denote $H_V := \mathrm{Hom}_{G(F)}(\text{c-Ind}_K^{G(F)} V, \pi)$ for simplicity; we suppose $H_V \neq 0$.

We note that the localisation of H_V at T_M as a $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)$-module, and as a $\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V)$-module, are isomorphic $\mathcal{Z}(M(F),M_0,V_{N(k)})$-modules.

The localisation at T_M is an exact functor hence if the localisation of H_V at T_M is 0, the same is true for the simple $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)$-submodules of H_V and the characters of $\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V)$ contained in H_V.

We suppose now π admissible. Then H_V is finite dimensional and admits a finite Jordan-Hölder filtration as a $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)$-module (or as a $\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V)$-module).

The localisation of H_V at T_M is not 0 if and only if the localisation at T_M of one of the simple quotients of H_V as a $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)$-module (or as a $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)$-module) is not 0.

Each character of $\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V)$ appearing as a subquotient of H_V also embeds in H_V because $\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V)$ is a finitely generated commutative algebra over the algebraically closed field C. The finite dimensional space H_V is the direct sum of its generalized eigenspaces $(H_V)_\chi$ with eigenvalue an algebra homomorphism $\chi : \mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V) \to C$.

Hence the localisation of H_V at T_M is not 0 if and only if the localisation at T_M of a character of $\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V)$ contained in H_V is not 0.

The characters of $\mathcal{Z}(G(F),K,V)$ contained in H_V are the central characters of the simple $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)$-submodules of H_V.

The localisation at T_M of a simple $\mathcal{H}(G(F),K,V)$-submodule is not 0 if and only if the localisation at T_M of its central character is not 0.

□

Herzig and Abe when G is F-split, K is hyperspecial and the characteristic of F is 0 ([Herzig] Lemma 9.9), used the property iii to define the K-supersingularity of π irreducible and admissible.

References

[Abe] Abe Noriyuki : *On a classification of admissible irreducible modulo p representations of a p-adic split reductive group*. Preprint 2011.

[Ramla] Abdellatif Ramla: *Autour des représentations modulo p des groupes réductifs p-adiques de rang* 1. Thesis in preparation.

[BL] Barthel Laure and Livne Ron : *Irreducible modular representations of GL2 of a local field*. Duke Math. J. Volume 75, Number 2 (1994), 261-292.

[Bki] Bourbaki Nicolas : *Groupes et algèbres de Lie, chapitres 4,5 et 6*. Hermann 1968.

[BTII] Bruhat F. et Tits J. : *Groupes réductifs sur un corps local*. Inst. Hautes Études Scient. Publications Mathématiques Vol. 60 (1984), part II, pp. 197-376.

[CE] Cabanes Marc and Enguehard Michel : *Representation theory of finite reductive groups.* Cambridge University Press 2004.

[Curtis] Curtis C. W. : *Modular representations of finite groups with split* (B, N)*-pairs.* In *Seminar on Algebraic groups and related finite groups* Lecture Notes in Math, 131, Springer-Verlag 1970, Chapter B.

[Emerton] Emerton Matthew : *Ordinary parts of admissible representations of p-adic reductive groups I.* Astérisque 331, 2010, p. 355-402.

[HV] Henniart Guy and Vigneras Marie-France : *A Satake isomorphism for representations modulo p of reductive groups over local fields.* Preprint 2011.

[Herzig] Herzig Florian : *The classification of admissible irreducible modulo p representations of a p-adic* GL_n. To appear in Inventiones Math.

[HerzigW] Herzig Florian : *The weight in a Serre-type conjecture for tame n-dimensional Galois represetnations*. Duke Math. J. 149 (1): 37-116, 2009.

[HS] Hilton P.J., Stammbach U. : *A Course in Homological Algebra*. GTM 4 , 1971. Springer-Verlag

[Ly] Ly Tony : *Irreducible representations modulo p representations of* $GL(2, D)$. In preparation.

[VigD] Vigneras Marie-France : *Représentations irréductibles de* $GL(2, F)$ *modulo p.* In L-functions and Galois representations, ed. Burns, Buzzard, Nekovar, LMS Lecture Notes 320 (2007)

[VLivre] Vignéras Marie-France : *Représentations* ℓ*-modulaires d'un groupe réductif p-adique avec* $\ell \neq p$. PM 137. Birkhauser (1996).

Guy Henniart
Univ. Paris–Sud, Laboratoire de Mathématiques d'Orsay
Orsay Cedex F–91405 ; CNRS, UMR 8628, Orsay Cedex F–91405
Guy.Henniart@math.u-psud.fr

Vignéras Marie-France
Université de Paris 7, Institut de Mathematiques de Jussieu, 175 rue du Chevaleret, Paris 75013, France,
vigneras@math.jussieu.fr